

FY 03 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE

CHAPTER 2

RESOURCES

Section	Page
1. GENERAL REMARKS	2-3
2. PROGRAMMATIC OVERVIEW	
USACE PROGRAM SUMMARY	2-5
CUSTOMER MSC/LAB OVERVIEW	
MILITARY PROGRAM MANAGERS	2-6
MP CONSTRUCTION, ARMY	2-7
MP CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE	2-8
MP CONSTRUCTION, DOD AND OTHER	2-9
MP INSTALLATION SUPPORT OFFICES	2-10
MP OMA DERP - IRP	2-11
MP OMA DERP - FUDS	2-12
MP BRAC - ER	2-13
MP EQ PROGRAM	2-14
MP OMA DERP - OTHER DOD	2-15
CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM MANAGERS	2-16
CW GENERAL EXPENSES	2-17
CW GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	2-18
CW CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	2-19
CW O&M GENERAL	2-20
CW MR&T	2-21
CW REGULATORY PROGRAM	2-22
CW OTHER DIRECT (FUSRAP)	2-23
CW OTHER DIRECT (FCCE)	2-24
CW OTHER DIRECT (COASTAL WETLANDS)	2-25
CW EPA SUPERFUND	2-26
CW OTHER ERS	2-27
CW OTHER INTERAGENCY & INTERNATIONAL SERVICE (IIS).....	2-28

RESOURCES (CONT'D)

Section	Page
REAL ESTATE PROGRAM MANAGERS	2-29
RE DOD RECRUITING, LEASE ADMINISTRATION	2-30
RE DOD RECRUITING & USACE GSA OCCUPIED LEASES	2-31
RE LEASED GOVERNMENT HOUSING PROGRAM	2-32
RE CIVIL DIRECT.....	2-33
RE CIVIL REIMBURSABLE	2-34
RE HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROG (LABOR & WKLD)	2-35
RE OPERATIONS, ARMY REIMBURSABLE	2-36
RE OPERATIONS, AIR FORCE REIMBURSABLE	2-37
RE SUPPORT TO ARMY	2-38
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM MANAGERS	2-39
R&D ERDC (DIRECT AND REIMBURSABLE)	2-40
 3. OTHER - PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE	
HR REGIONALIZATION	2-41
USACE FINANCE CENTER RATES	2-42
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)	2-44
MILITARY PROGRAMS STANDARD DEFINITIONS	2-55
MILITARY PROGRAMS INSTALLATION SUPPORT PROGRAM	2-64
MANPOWER	2-65
PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUSINESS PROCESS (PMBP)	2-71
EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT FUNDING	2-73
SUPERVISION & ADMINISTRATION (S&A)	2-74
COST OF DOING BUSINESS	2-76
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	2-81
PLANT REPLACEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (PRIP)	2-84
FACILITIES GUIDANCE	2-85
LOGISTICS GUIDANCE	2-91
CONTRACTING OUT GUIDANCE	2-97
COMMAND STAFF INSPECTIONS (CSI)	2-98
CONFERENCES	2-99
USACE MANAGEMENT CONTROL PLAN	2-100
USACE SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM	2-103

GENERAL REMARKS

1. This chapter is a road map to the resource guidance governing the allocation of resources given to USACE for mission accomplishment. This chapter identifies program managers, major sources of funds, estimated program, manpower allocations and high grade policy, supervision and administration rates, cost of doing business targets, command inspection schedules, and other guidance useful in developing Regional Business Center operating plans, local operating budgets, and measuring performance of field activities.
2. All commanders are reminded that OMB Circular A-76, as augmented by higher authority implementing guidance, must be used for determining the performance of commercial activities using government facilities and personnel or by contract. This includes decisions regarding new starts, expansions, and existing services. Conversions to contract solely to avoid personnel ceilings or salary limitations are prohibited by the Circular.
3. The **USACE Program Summary** represents a three-year macro update of program for the Command. It is provided to assist Regional Management Boards (RMBs) in developing their three-year Command Operating Budgets (COB). The Program Summary is based on the FY 03 President's Budget and latest revision to the Program Objective Memorandum (POM). The Military program amounts include both direct and reimbursable programs combined for our major customers. The program amounts for Civil Works direct appropriations and Support For Others (SFO) work are reported separately. The data shown in this summary were extracted from the USACE Integrated Command Resource Information (ICRI) Data Tables updated by USACE program managers.
4. The charts presented in the **Customer MSC/Lab Overview** Section represent USACE program managers allocation of program to MSC/Labs for the next three years. These amounts too, as in the USACE Program Summary chart, are based on the FY 03 President's Budget and latest revision to the POM. In most cases, unless otherwise indicated on the charts, the program amounts shown reflect only the USACE direct program. Also provided with each chart, is the program manager's assessment of the program, i.e., the direction of the program, what is included in the program, and significant events.

USACE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

1. Application of the USACE Resource Management Principles will improve our internal processes, complement the Project Management Business Process, and further demonstrate our commitment to operate as a "learning organization". Command Planning Group POC is L. Leonard Wolner, CEPG-R, 202-761-0307. Resource Management POC is Jerry Zuppe, CERM-P, 202-761-1432.

SECTION 1

RESOURCES

GENERAL REMARKS (CONT'D)

2. The USACE Resource Committee, under the charter to propose new processes for obtaining and allocating resources for strategic purposes, developed the Resource Management Principles during FY02. These principles, endorsed by the Issues Management Board and approved by the Command Council, are intended to remind and guide all levels of the organization to carefully consider resource implications through every stage of an initiative, program or project. The principles are consistent with existing USACE RM Operating Principles and associated laws and regulations.

USACE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

1. INITIATIVE/PROGRAM FORMULATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Calculate Impacts on Districts• Determine Total Life Cycle Cost; provide funding & acquisition strategy• Periodically review initiatives for compliance with baseline parameters
2. EXECUTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Issue funds to field ASAP• Involve field in decisions affecting the field—initiatives & programs
3. REPORTING	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Get formats up front• Review existing reports for relevancy—delete where needed• Eliminate duplication
4. ALLOCATION RULES	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allocate resources IAW w/Commanders intent• Adhere to laws & regulations to promote accountability & good stewardship
5. BUSINESS PRACTICES	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify & use best business practices• Maximize decentralized control of resources
6. MEASUREMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Link formulation, execution with meaningful reporting measures
7. STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allocate a % of funds for strategic initiatives start-up• Plan and Program strategic initiatives
8. UNEXPECTED	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Employ Commanders Reserve for out of cycle requirements

SECTION 2

USACE PROGRAM SUMMARY

FY 03 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE

USACE PROGRAM SUMMARY (DIRECT + REIMB)

FY 03-05 ESTIMATED PROGRAM (\$ MILLIONS)

SOURCE: OCTOBER 2002 ICRI TABLES

USACE	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
Military Programs	8,131	8,047	8,885
Civil Works	5,570	5,369	5,372
Total	13,951	13,416	14,257

Military Programs	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
Army, Construction	2,325	2,378	3,186
Air Force, Construction	1,242	919	947
DOD	1,207	1,204	1,059
Environmental (DERP/BRAC)	940	779	793
Engineering & Design	777	776	859
Real Estate	262	257	262
RDT&E	287	292	297
Host Nation/FMS	1,072	1,114	1,174
Other (e.g., ED&M)	269	328	308

Civil Works	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
General Investigations	108	108	108
Construction General	1,440	1,440	1,440
Operations & Maintenance	1,979	1,979	1,979
Flood Control, MR&T	288	288	288
General Expense	161	161	161
Other Direct (Regulatory Prgm, FUSRAP, Non-Fed)	851	805	802
SFO Environmental	298	298	298
SFO All Other	445	290	296

SECTION 2

MILITARY PROGRAMS

PROGRAM MANAGERS AND DOCUMENTATION

PROGRAMS MANAGEMENT DIVISION - CEMP-M

TYLER, J. JOSEPH. - Chief, 761-8656

ARMY & AIR FORCE BRANCH - CEMP-MA

STICKLEY, HOWARD - Chief, 761-1995

DEFENSE/SUPPORT FOR OTHERS BRANCH - CEMP-MD

WIERICK, KIM – CHIEF, 761-8636

PROGRAMS INTEGRATION & BUSINESS PROCESS BRANCH

PINOL, PHIL – CHIEF, 761-1321

ENVIRONMENTAL DIVISION - CEMP-R

RIVERS, PATRICIA - Chief, 761-0858

POLICY AND REQUIREMENTS BRANCH - CEMP-RA

GREGG, KEN - Chief, 761-1177

FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES BRANCH - CEMP-RF

LUBBERT, BOB - Chief, 761-4950

ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT BRANCH - CEMP-RI

BALLIF, JAMES - Chief, 761-8880

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND SUPERFUND SUPPORT BRANCH - CEMP-RS

BRASSE, BILL - Chief, 761-8879

INSTALLATION SUPPORT DIVISION - CEMP-I

ALLAMAN, KRISTINE L. - Chief, 761-5763

PLANNING BRANCH - CEMP-IP

REYNOLDS, STEPHEN- Chief, 761-5786

INSTALLATION SUPPORT POLICY BRANCH - CEMP-IO

LOVO, JIM – CHIEF, 761-0052

INTERAGENCY & INTERNATIONAL SERVICES DIVISION – CEMP-N

MELE, MICHAEL – ACTING CHIEF, 761-5644

INTERAGENCY AFFAIRS BRANCH – CEMP-ND

KISICKI, DONALD - Chief, 761-4273

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BRANCH – CEMP-NI

JACKSON, DALE – CHIEF, 761-1122

SECTION 2

MILITARY PROGRAMS

MILITARY PROGRAMS

CONSTRUCTION, ARMY (CEMP-MA)
TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)
(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
HNC	159,331	187,720	180,525
LRD	117,664	145,002	222,917
NAD	293,257	394,720	684,750
NWD	240,750	196,150	258,750
POD	410,962	738,238	808,460
SAD	287,750	217,900	225,400
SPD	8,600	17,700	82,250
SWD	118,000	147,050	157,600
TAC	8,600	0	0
TOTAL	1,644,914	2,044,480	2,620,652

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

Program figures reflect PRESBUD with adjustments to FY 03 for AT/FP and potential FY 04 plus up. **MCA** - Program averages between \$1.5B to \$1.9B. This is almost double in size from last year's projection. **AFHC** - Program is showing a continual growth from \$114M in FY 03 to a high of \$813M in FY 05. **MCAR** - Program is showing continual growth from \$49M in FY 03 to \$92M in FY 05.

SECTION 2

MILITARY PROGRAMS

MILITARY PROGRAMS

CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE (CEMP-MA)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
HNC	0	0	0
LRD	24,900	10,400	12,800
NAD	221,453	86,055	63,002
NWD	123,447	142,788	162,950
POD	94,155	51,620	64,352
SAD	63,150	60,605	36,295
SPD	114,210	52,900	117,131
SWD	98,000	95,055	96,518
TAC	0	0	0
TOTAL	739,315	499,423	553,048

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

The Corps of Engineers is responsible for design and construction of approximately 80 to 85 percent of the annual Military Construction Air Force (MCAF) program. The Corps is responsible for a portion of the Air Force Reserve MILCON Program (MAFR) which is included in the above projections. The average for FY 03 – FY 05 is approximately \$20 million annually. Also included in the above projections is the Family Housing Air Force (FHAF) – approximately \$213 million in FY 03, \$107 million in FY 04 and \$125 million in FY 05.

SECTION 2

MILITARY PROGRAMS

MILITARY PROGRAMS

CONSTRUCTION, DOD AND OTHER (CEMP-MD)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
HNC	0	0	0
LRD	4,600	0	4,400
NAD	249,796	212,000	147,400
NWD	0	42,500	22,000
POD	102,000	116,800	48,000
SAD	47,200	48,700	40,600
SPD	0	10,800	11,000
SWD	0	4,200	23,200
TAC	100,000	100,000	100,000
TOTAL	503,596	535,000	396,600

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

Some of the DOD & Support for Others components are listed below:

Program	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
DoDM	\$96,000	\$122,000	\$132,000
DLA	\$31,100	\$121,500	\$57,900
DCPS	\$150,000	\$80,000	\$20,000
USSOCOM	\$42,200	\$47,400	\$24,500
FMS	\$123,900	\$111,200	\$105,000

Program figures derived from POM, customer input and PM best estimates. GMD program not included in this data.

SECTION 2

MILITARY PROGRAMS

MILITARY PROGRAMS

INSTALLATION SUPPORT PROGRAM (DIRECT)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

RPMA SUPPORT TO DIRECTORATES OF PUBLIC WORKS

(\$000)

MSC	FTEs	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	4	620	645	675
NAD	12	1,535	1,630	1,695
NWD	8	1,200	1,250	1,300
POD	8	1,195	1,270	1,325
SAD	8	1,325	1,380	1,435
SPD	4	765	795	830
SWD	8	1,085	1,130	1,175
TAC	2	235	235	235
HQ IS	0	240	450	450
TOTAL	54	8,200	8,785	9,120

Program Manager's Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05.

1. Funding for labor increases 4% in FY 03, 4.0% in FY 04, and 4.0% in FY 05.
2. FY 03 Funding has taken a \$260,000 reduction. Previous FY 03 total was \$8,465,000. FY 04 and FY 05 funding based on \$8,465, not the \$8,200.
3. The USACE Installation Support Program is an integrated mix of direct and reimbursable funds. MSCs have the responsibility to build an integrated program providing both regional and customer specific support, using both direct and reimbursable funds.
4. MVD phased out the PM-Forward at Rock Island Arsenal at the end of FY 02.
5. A decision matrix for Resource Allocation was used. Smoothing factors were used so no MSC took more than a +/- 10% change. This matrix evaluates each MSC on the following criteria from the installations in the MSC's AO: # of primary installations, # of total square feet, # of total acres, Military population served, # of PPPs, PSPs and IBCTs in each AO. Subjective factors were used for TIM Liaison positions (\$40K/liaison) and stationing of FTEs OCONUS (\$105K split between POD & NAD).

SECTION 2

MILITARY PROGRAMS

MILITARY PROGRAMS

OMA DERP - IRP (DIRECT / REIMB) (CEMP-RI)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03 DIR / REIMB	FY 04 DIR / REIMB	FY 05 DIR / REIMB
HNC	50 / 0	50 / 0	50 / 0
LRD	10,000 / 14,000	10,000 / 14,000	10,000 / 14,000
NAD	28,000 / 14,000	28,000 / 14,000	28,000 / 14,000
NWD	10,000 / 32,000	10,000 / 32,000	10,000 / 32,000
POD	0 / 10,000	0 / 10,000	0 / 10,000
SAD	23,000 / 22,000	23,000 / 22,000	23,000 / 22,000
SPD	15,000 / 15,000	15,000 / 15,000	15,000 / 15,000
SWD	7,000 / 8,000	7,000 / 8,000	7,000 / 8,000
DSMOA- STATES	5,000 / 0	5,000 / 0	5,000 / 0
HQ	1,500 / 0	1,500 / 0	1,500 / 0
TOTAL	99,550 / 115,000	99,550 / 115,000	99,550 / 115,000

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

Funding for the Environmental Restoration, Army (ER,A) Program should remain stable. The above are estimates. The MSC estimates for any fiscal year are NOT known until Nov of the FY, and the total actual program is not known until 30 Sep of that FY. The change-over to TIM may effect a change in our level of funding as well as our method of funding (Dir vs Reimb).

SECTION 2

MILITARY PROGRAMS

MILITARY PROGRAMS

OMA DERP – FUDS (DIRECT) (CEMP-RF)
TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)
(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
HNC	12,220	5,220	5,220
LRD	13,142	16,089	16,727
NAD	20,703	23,775	24,603
NWD	40,446	37,850	39,101
POD	29,643	30,246	31,112
SAD	11,748	13,627	14,103
SPD	42,669	47,458	48,882
SWD	16,281	16,078	16,494
DSMOA-STATES	5,000	5,000	5,000
HQ	9,140	9,275	9,275
HQDA	11,110	12,000	12,000
TOTAL	212,102	216,618	222,517

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

Funding for the military environmental programs should remain stable over the next few years. Note that the HQ line for FY 03, FY 04 and FY 05 include contingency funding totaling \$2.0M. These funds will be issued to districts for project execution as requirements are identified. The NWD numbers include HTRW CX costs.

SECTION 2

MILITARY PROGRAMS

MILITARY PROGRAMS

BRAC – ER (DIRECT) (CEMP-RI)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
HNC	-	-	-
LRD	7,000	12,000	9,000
NAD	31,000	9,000	10,000
NWD	9,800	4,000	2,500
POD	-	-	-
SAD	25,500	12,000	13,000
SPD	20,200	9,000	10,000
SWD	7,200	7,000	5,000
DSMOA-STATES	900	800	500
HQ	2,900	2,900	2,900
TOTAL	104,500	56,700	52,900

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

Only direct BRAC-ER is shown in the above chart since reimbursable funding to specific divisions cannot be predicted accurately.

SECTION 2

MILITARY PROGRAMS

MILITARY PROGRAMS

EQ PROGRAM (REIMB) (CEMP-RI)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
HNC	1,000	1,000	1,000
LRD	14,000	14,000	14,000
NAD	14,000	14,000	14,000
NWD	29,000	29,000	29,000
POD	34,000	34,000	34,000
SAD	45,000	45,000	45,000
SPD	21,000	21,000	21,000
SWD	42,000	42,000	42,000
TAW	0	0	0
HQ	0	0	0
TOTAL	200,000	200,000	200,000

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

Funding for the Environmental Quality Program will remain steady. The above are estimates. We do not receive an obligation plan for any EQ work. The USACE knows we will execute work and the dollar value of the work when the MIPR arrives from the customer.

SECTION 2

MILITARY PROGRAMS

MILITARY PROGRAMS

OMA DERP - OTHER DOD (REIMB) (CEMP-RI)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
HNC	8,000	6,000	6,000
LRD	0	0	0
NAD	0	0	0
NWD	15,000	12,000	12,000
POD	0	0	0
SAD	2,000	2,000	2,000
SPD	2,000	2,000	2,000
SWD	0	0	0
DSMOA	0	0	0
HQ	0	0	0
TOTAL	27,000	22,000	22,000

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

Funding for the WFO – Other DOD (Reimb) shows a decline. The above are estimates. The funds are from AFBCA (BRAC-ER), DLA-ER, & DLA-BRAC. We do not receive an obligation plan for this work. The HQ no longer tracks Air Force active sites restoration ER,AF because we no longer receive M&S from the HQAF.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

PROGRAM MANAGERS AND DOCUMENTATION

1. General Investigations:
Program Manager: Wanda Cook, CECW-BW, 202-761-5853
2. Construction, General:
Program Manager: Leonard Henry, CECW-BE, 202-761-5856
3. Operation & Maintenance, General:
Program Manager: Joseph Bittner, CECW-BC, 202-761-4130
Alternate: Mark Pointon, CECW-BC, 202-761-4133
4. Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries:
Program Manager: Kyle Jones, CECW-BC, 202-761-4105
5. General Expenses:
Program Manager: Judy Champion, CERM-B, 202-761-1820
Appropriation Account Manager: John Micik, CECW-BA, 202-761-4114
6. Regulatory Program:
Program Manager: Charles Stark, CECW-OR, 202-761-4664
Appropriation Account Manager: John Micik, CECW-BA, 202-761-4114
7. Flood Control & Coastal Emergencies:
Program Manager: Ed Hecker, CECW-OE, 202-761-4601
Appropriation Account Manager: John Micik, CECW-BA, 202-761-4114
8. Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP):
Program Manager: Sharon Wagner, CECW-BA, 202-761-4113
9. Coastal Wetlands Restoration Trust Fund:
Program Manager: Bruce Heide, CECW-BC, 202-761-4155
Appropriation Account Manager: Mark Guest, CERM-BE, 202-761-0067
10. Support for Others - Reimbursable Funding:
Program Manager: Al Bertini, CEMP-NE, 202-761-4271
11. Project Cooperation Agreements (PCAs):
Program Manager: Doug Lamont, CECW-PC, 202-761-7664

SECTION 2**CIVIL WORKS****CIVIL WORKS****GENERAL EXPENSES**

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	10,968	11,233	11,570
MVD	10,210	10,457	10,770
NAD	9,594	9,826	10,121
NWD	9,590	9,822	10,116
POD	3,231	3,309	3,408
SAD	10,090	10,334	10,644
SPD	10,217	10,465	10,778
SWD	8,458	8,663	8,923
HQs	58,279	59,688	61,479
OTHER CE OFFICES	21,943	22,473	23,147
TOTAL GEN EXP	152,580	156,270	160,956

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	10,600	10,600	10,900
MVD	12,100	12,100	12,400
NAD	10,600	10,600	11,400
NWD	7,500	7,500	7,200
POD	2,700	2,700	2,800
SAD	6,100	6,100	6,300
SPD	19,300	19,300	19,800
SWD	8,900	8,900	9,100
TOTAL GEN INV	77,800	77,800	79,900

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

The General Investigations program is flat through the year 2005. The FY 03 Budget is a constrained planning program level. Adjustments to this program level will be made dependent upon the successes of the individual studies underway and the annual Energy and Water Development Appropriation Acts. The MSC ceilings in the outyears reflected by the annual program EC reflect a growth of 2.5%.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	256,800	426,900	399,900
MVD	138,341	166,000	172,200
NAD	223,899	177,700	225,900
NWD	179,274	178,900	194,900
POD	25,484	22,100	25,900
SAD	290,700	276,500	287,800
SPD	180,000	146,500	128,100
SWD	91,300	54,000	62,200
HQ	157,656	151,000	152,600
TOTAL CONST GEN	1,543,454	1,599,600	1,649,500

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

The gross FY 03 Construction, General program request prior to the application of an adjustment for savings and slippage, is \$1.543 Billion. The gross Construction, General program ceiling, remains flat at \$1.600 billion and \$1.649 billion in FY 04 and FY 05, respectively, and thereafter. Adjustments to the Construction, General program will be made each year after passage of the annual Energy and Water Development Appropriation Acts to reflect the funding level actually provided.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

O&M GENERAL

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	349,243	439,000	452,000
MVD	354,675	446,000	459,000
NAD	206,554	260,000	268,000
NWD	226,467	285,000	294,000
POD	10,515	13,000	13,000
SAD	308,949	389,000	401,000
SPD	100,011	126,000	130,000
SWD	266,922	336,000	346,000
Remaining Items	109,735	47,000	48,000
Federal Retiree Costs	65,000	67,000	69,000
Savings and Slippages	-19,091	-8,000	-8,000
Total O&M GEN	1,979,000	2,400,000	2,472,000

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

The FY 03 Budget includes a separate estimate of \$64 million for Homeland Security (HLS). Full funding federal retiree costs is included for the first time in the FY 03 budget. Direct funding by the Bonneville Power Administration would increase the amount for NWD by \$118 million for FY03. A New MOA is anticipated to increase the direct funding for FY 04 and FY 05 to about \$122 million and \$126 million, respectively. The Administration remaining Power Marketing Agencies (PMA) directly fund hydropower O&M costs proposes to offset appropriations by about \$149 million in FY 03 and commensurable amounts in FY 04 and FY 05. Considering the financial ability of the PMAs offsets could be delayed until the end of the respective fiscal year.

O&M funds are also augmented, slightly, by a distribution of under the Maintenance and Operation of Dams account about \$7 million. OMB guidance keeps the O&M bottom line flat at \$1.979 billion from FY 03 through FY 05. The above table is intended to reduce the critical backlog in the outyears. Other increases could result from significant national weather-related emergencies to be covered by emergency supplemental appropriations.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
MVD	288,000	289,000	298,000

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

The Mississippi River and Tributaries program is essentially flat for Fiscal Years 2003 and Fiscal Year 2004, experiences a major reduction from Fiscal Year 2002. Although there is an upward trend from FY 03 to FY 04 and FY 05, the funding level does not reach the FY 02 level. However, the FY 03 program will allow the overall MR&T project to remain on schedule through providing a funding priority to the construction of the Mississippi River Levees project and other Main Stem components. However, specific delays will be encountered in completion of some of the tributaries basins. There should be no impacts to the operations and maintenance of the main stem projects. Although there should be no impacts to the operation of the tributaries projects, the maintenance backlog will continue to grow. The MR&T program will be adjusted each year after enactment of the annual Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts to reflect the funding level actually provided.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

REGULATORY PROGRAM

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	20,300	20,800	21,600
MVD	19,700	20,300	21,000
NAD	25,000	25,800	26,600
NWD	17,300	17,700	18,300
POD	8,300	8,500	8,800
SAD	27,800	28,600	29,500
SPD	13,500	13,900	14,400
SWD	10,300	10,600	11,000
LABS	1,800	1,800	1,800
TOTAL	144,000	148,000	153,000

Program Manager's Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

The FY 03 budget supports the increasing permit workload in the districts, particularly the workload increases expected from the revisions to Nationwide permits, which took effect in FY 00. The FY 03 Budget is a substantial increase in funding from FY 02 and is intended to reduce permit evaluation time significantly. Recommended program amounts for FY 04-05 would maintain performance at the FY 03 level. However, these amounts are subject to the annual budget and appropriation process and actual funding levels may be less.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

OTHER DIRECT (FUSRAP)

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	45,000	0	0
MVD	50,500	0	0
NAD	44,500	0	0
NWD	0	0	0
POD	0	0	0
SAD		0	0
SPD	0	0	0
SWD	0	0	0
TOTAL FUSRAP	140,000	0	0

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

The FUSRAP account has been funded at \$140,000 million since FY 01. This constrained level of funding has allowed work to progress at a moderate pace. Outyear estimates are being developed in accordance with program priorities and adjustments in project schedules.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

OTHER DIRECT (FCCE)

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

Program Manager's Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

The President's Budget for FY 03 request \$20 million for the FCCE account. This will be added to the carryover from FY 02 and used to meet the requirements of the program in FY 03.

However, due to the event-driven nature of the FCCE account, total MSC programs cannot be estimated and additional funds will be requested when the balance in the account is expected to be insufficient to support the preparedness program and emergency response activities.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

OTHER DIRECT (COASTAL WETLANDS)

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
MVD	58,086	60,732	64,008

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

Breaux Act funding is provided by the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and comes from excise taxes on fishing equipment and fuel taxes on motorboat and small engines. On October 20, 1999, Public Law 106-74 amended the Breaux Act to provide funding authority through FY 00. On November 1, 2000, Public Law 106-408 amended the Breaux Act to provide funding authority through FY 09.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

EPA SUPERFUND

REIMBURSABLE FUNDING (\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	3,000	2,000	2,000
MVD	1,000	1,000	1,000
NAD	175,000	165,000	160,000
NWD	55,000	50,000	50,000
POD	0	0	0
SAD	8,000	8,000	5,000
SPD	15,000	12,000	10,000
SWD	5,000	3,000	2,000
OTHER CE OFFICES	0	0	0
TOTAL OTHER SFO	262,000	241,000	230,000

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

“EPA Superfund” consists of hazardous, toxic and radioactive waste removal and remediation work the Corps performs for EPA in compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). The above forecasts for future work are based upon funds we currently have on hand and project to receive during the coming year.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

OTHER ERS

REIMBURSABLE FUNDING (\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	12,000	8,000	6,000
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	3,000	2,000	2,000
NWD	20,000	15,000	15,000
POD	12,000	10,000	8,000
SAD	1,000	1,000	1,000
SPD	1,000	1,000	1,000
SWD	6,000	5,000	5,000
OTHER CE OFFICES	1,000	1,000	1,000
TOT OTHER ERS	56,000	43,000	39,000

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

“Other ERS” consists of hazardous, toxic, and radioactive waste management and remediation work the Corps performs for other agencies or entities (not including EPA Superfund). The above forecasts for future work are based upon work we have performed in the past, expected continuation of the ongoing work until completion and any new work that may result from the outreach efforts currently underway.

SECTION 2

CIVIL WORKS

CIVIL WORKS

OTHER INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SERVICES (IIS) (FORMERLY
SUPPORT FOR OTHERS)

REIMBURSABLE FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	18,000	18,000	18,000
MVD	4,000	4,000	4,000
NAD	155,000	155,000	155,000
NWD	35,000	35,000	35,000
POD	35,000	35,000	35,000
SAD	54,000	54,000	54,000
SPD	75,000	75,000	75,000
SWD	70,000	70,000	70,000
OTHER CE OFFICES	34,000	34,000	34,000
TOTAL OTHER SFO	480,000	480,000	480,000

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 - FY 05

“Other Interagency and International Services (IIS)” (formerly known as “Support for Others”) consists of work the Corps performs for other agencies or entitles relating to vertical construction, facilities and infrastructure. The above forecasts for future work are based upon work we have performed in the past, expected continuation of the ongoing work until completion and any requests for new work.

PROGRAM MANAGERS AND DOCUMENTATION

1. The allocation targets for direct funded Real Estate Army work are based on the FY 03-05 Program Budget Guidance (PBG) as provided by CERM-B. No specific document allocates resources for Reimbursable real estate military work estimates (Army, Air Force and other). These projections are based on customers and districts projections. The Program Manager is Bret Griffin, CERE-R, 202-761-7573.
2. No specific document allocates resources for reimbursable civil real estate functions. This is because of the various agreements under which reimbursable work is undertaken. Program Manager, Robert Vining, CECW-B, 202-761-4100 and Real Estate POC is Bret Griffin, CERE - R-PD, 202-761-7573.
3. Homeowners Assistance Program (HAP) funding authorizations are based on approved HAP actions. Funding targets depicted are contingent upon realization of projected workload. Program Manager: Don Chapman, CERE-M-D, 202-761-7575. Real Estate Manpower POC is Bret Griffin, CERE-P, 202-761-7573.
4. DOD Recruiting and Leased Government Housing Programs funding authorizations are based on approved leasing actions. Program estimates comprise the lease payments, administration, and the expenses for operations and maintenance of leased facilities. Program Manager: Don Chapman, CERE-M-D, 202-761-7575. Real Estate Manpower POC is Bret Griffin, CERE-P, 202-761-7573.

SECTION 2

REAL ESTATE

REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

DOD RECRUITING, LEASE ADMINISTRATION

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	1,600	1,648	1,697
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	4,275	4,403	4,535
NWD	3,225	3,322	3,421
POD	300	309	318
SAD	3,000	3,090	3,183
SPD	3,050	3,141	3,236
SWD	2,375	2,446	2,520
UNDIST/HQPRG	5,175	5,330	5,490
TOTAL DOD REC LEASE ADMIN	23,000	23,689	24,400

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 – FY 05

The PBG estimate for FY 04 and FY 05 is the same as FY 03 less inflation. The DOD Recruiting Program PBG will be adjusted to provide funding for actions requested by the DOD Recruiting Commands in the year before execution.

In FY 03 – FY 05 emphasis will be placed on force protection and improved recruiting station quality of life. Security assessments will be conducted for all recruiting stations nation-wide. There will be increased emphasis on station upgrades to bring all stations up to quality standards, which will make stations more appealing to public as well as better working areas for recruiters. We anticipate executing the office of the future initiative in FY 03.

SECTION 2

REAL ESTATE

REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

DOD RECRUITING & USACE GSA OCCUPIED LEASES

DIRECT FUNDING (\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	17,400	17,922	18,460
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	33,500	34,505	35,540
NWD	20,450	21,063	21,695
POD	1,600	1,648	1,697
SAD	20,200	20,806	21,430
SPD	19,000	19,570	20,157
SWD	17,375	17,896	18,433
UFC <u>1</u> / Includes USACE & DOD GSA Leases	41,000	42,230	43,497
UNDIST/HQPRG	2,946	3,034	3,125
TOTAL DOD RECRUITING LEASES (Includes USACE & DOD GSA Leases)	173,471	178,674	184,034

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 – FY 05

The PBG estimate for FY 04 and FY 05 is the same as FY 03 less inflation. The DOD Recruiting Program PBG will be adjusted to provide funding for actions requested by the DOD Recruiting Commands in the year before execution.

Emphasis will be placed on force protection and recruiting station quality in FY 03 through FY 05. The program has experienced cost growth because of OSD policy changes which decreased influence of cost and increased influence of location as deciding factors in facility selection. POCs: Judy Silver, CERE-M-D, 202-761-7495, or Darvin Smith, CERE-M-D 202-761-7583.

SECTION 2

REAL ESTATE

REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

LEASED GOVERNMENT HOUSING PROGRAM

FUNDING (\$000)

MSC	FY 03		FY 04		FY 05	
	LABOR COST	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR COST	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR COST	TOTAL FUNDS
LRD	437	3,425	437	3,425	437	3,425
MVD	0	0	0	0	0	0
NAD	188	1,516	188	1,516	188	1,516
NWD	530	3,640	530	3,640	530	3,640
POD	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAD	445	2,930	445	2,930	445	2,930
SPD	157	1,300	157	1,300	157	1,300
SWD	242	1,850	242	1,850	242	1,850
UNDIST/ HQ PRG	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,999	14,661	1,999	14,661	1,999	14,661

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 – FY 05

The LGH program significantly increased in FY 02 with The Army almost doubling its program. In FY 03 – FY 05 this program will be at steady-state in that there will be no increases in overall leases, but the work will consist primarily of maintenance of current leases and acquiring about 33% new leases each year. Congress is expected to increase service members' basic allowance for housing (BAH) during FY 05. If this occurs and it becomes possible for service members and their families to live within their BAH plus 15%, this program will begin to phase out in FY 06. POCs: Jamie Paladino, CERE-M-D, 202-761-7545, or Darwin Smith, CERE-M-D 202-761-7583.

SECTION 2

REAL ESTATE

REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

CIVIL, DIRECT PROGRAM AND LABOR
FUNDING (\$000)

MSC	FY 03		FY 04		FY 05	
	LABOR COST	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR COST	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR COST	TOTAL FUNDS
LRD	14,934	28,630	15,382	29,489	15,843	30,374
MVD	16,670	18,998	17,170	19,568	17,685	20,155
NAD	5,283	15,043	5,441	15,494	5,604	15,959
NWD	8,998	13,097	9,267	13,490	9,546	13,895
POD	377	380	388	391	400	403
SAD	10,536	18,787	10,852	19,351	11,178	19,931
SPD	5,645	8,706	5,814	8,967	5,988	9,236
SWD	9,593	11,590	9,881	11,937	10,177	12,295
UNDIST/HQ PRG	1,994	2,036	2,054	2,097	2,115	2,160
TOTAL CIVIL, DIRECT	74,030	117,267	76,249	120,784	78,536	122,248

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 – FY 05

Compared to FY 02, the overall income/workload projection for FY 03 increased (5.3%). This increase may be void of consideration of post 9/11 challenges and opportunities, particularly within the O&M areas (e.g., increased emphasis on encroachments resolutions, compliance Inspections on Federal Lands, etc). Based on these data currently available and pending future impact assessments (e.g., Homeland Security Initiatives as well as normal Program add-ons), we will only project a 3% Program growth for the out-years FY 04-FY 05. District and MSC Program Managers should review their project data in coordination with the PM and RM to ensure that it is captured and reflected in the appropriate execution years.

SECTION 2

REAL ESTATE

REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

CIVIL, REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM AND
REIMBURSABLE LABOR FUNDING(\$000)

MSC	FY 03		FY 04		FY 05	
	LABOR	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR	TOTAL FUNDS
LRD	6,465	10,555	6,659	10,872	6,859	11,198
MVD	3,557	4,213	3,664	4,339	3,774	4,469
NAD	1,042	9,847	1,073	10,142	1,105	10,447
NWD	2,775	2,879	2,858	2,965	2,944	3,054
POD	106	109	109	112	112	116
SAD	5,871	14,119	6,047	14,542	6,228	14,979
SPD	4,115	7,176	4,238	7,391	4,365	7,613
SWD	4,729	6,051	4,871	6,696	5,024	6,897
UNDIST/H QPRG	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL CIVIL, REIMB	28,660	54,949	29,519	57,059	30,411	58,773

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 – FY 05

Compared to FY 02, the overall income/workload projection for FY 03 increased significantly (39%). Based on these data, we encourage managers to review their project data in coordination with the PM and RM to ensure that it is captured and reflected in the appropriate execution years.

SECTION 2

REAL ESTATE

REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (HAP)

DIRECT FUNDING (LABOR & WORKLOAD)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03		FY 04		FY 05	
	LABOR & ADMIN	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR & ADMIN	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR & ADMIN	TOTAL FUNDS
SAD	585	1,957	407	1,281	108	430
SPD	1,369	9,888	1,838	12,406	494	2,357
SWD	955	2,489	733	1,837	622	622
UNDIST/HQ PRG	532	1,322	437	1,269	392	1,251
TOTAL	2,486	15,656	3,415	16,793	1,616	4,660

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 – FY 05

In spite of a new program at Altus AFB and anticipated emphasis on A-76 contracting throughout DoD, overall program requirements continue to diminish. Some additional programs are being projected for the future including Edwards AFB, Cold Harbor, ME, and Mountain Home AFB. While the districts are working to accurately estimate the potential size of these possible programs, as well as the impacts of A-76 contracting nation-wide, accurate estimates will not be forthcoming until more data becomes available. We anticipate a significant program decline in FY 05 primarily due to completion of the Army, Navy and Air Force programs on Oahu. Congress is discussing the need for two additional rounds of base closures. If new legislation is enacted to close or realign additional facilities, the dollar amounts for FY 04-05 and beyond may increase substantially. POCs: Lee Bevins, CERE-M-D, 202-761-7570, or Imogene Newsome, CERM-B 202-761-0531.

SECTION 2

REAL ESTATE

REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

REAL ESTATE OPERATIONS, ARMY REIMBURSABLE
REIMBURSABLE LABOR FUNDING
(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	214	220	227
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	243	250	258
NWD	712	734	756
POD	945	973	1003
SAD	1,330	1,371	1,412
SPD	380	391	403
SWD	427	440	453
UNDIST/HQPRG	0	0	0
TOTAL REO, ARMY, REIMB	4,251	4,279	4,512

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 – FY 05

We must continue to assist customers in programming and budgeting for the real estate requirements that exceed our current ability to direct fund. Over the years our customers have also experienced decreases in available funding. The need for close workload coordination is essential from district to installation, MSC and MACOM/TIM levels. Several activities if financed represent significant revenue and, or expense offset opportunities for the military. For example the Army's initiatives for privatization of utilities, the family housing commercialization push and greater emphasis on outgranting federal lands through enhanced leasing procedures and Homeland Security issues.

SECTION 2

REAL ESTATE

REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

REAL ESTATE OPERATIONS, AIR FORCE REIMBURSABLE
REIMBURSABLE LABOR FUNDING
(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	300	310	318
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	903	930	950
NWD	1,700	1,950	2,000
POD	800	824	840
SAD	930	950	986
SPD	850	650	670
SWD	348	350	360
UNDIST/HQPRG	145	150	155
TOTAL REO, AIR FORCE REIMB	5,976	6,114	6,279

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 – FY 05

Our ability to program the necessary manpower resources to execute the Air Force's real estate work requires close coordination with the Air Force Real Estate team members at Base/District, MSC and MAJCOM/MACOM levels. We must identify the program year workload estimates in order for us to reserve the FTE for execution in those program years. The FY 03 target represents a slight increase in workload.

SECTION 2

REAL ESTATE

REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

REAL ESTATE SUPPORT TO ARMY

DIRECT LABOR FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
LRD	345	345	345
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	620	620	620
NWD	925	925	925
POD	410	410	410
SAD	689	689	689
SPD	423	423	423
SWD	250	250	350
UNDIST/HQPRG	20	20	20
TOTAL REAL ESTATE SUPPORT	3,682	3,682	3,682

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 – FY 05

The funding for this program remains at the current level through FY 03. We expect POM level consideration for increased funding in FY 04. The current funding level is not adequate to support the USACE mission execution for maintenance and stewardship of The Army's real property base. The Army and other military departments may not be able to take advantage of cost saving and revenue generating opportunities if program funds are not increased. Real Estate Program Managers at all levels (installation/district, etc) should coordinate their efforts to ensure that the unfunded real estate requirements for the program years are submitted for inclusion into the respective MACOM's program budgets. Additionally, each District should identify their unfunded requirements during the HQUSACE Midyear Review.

SECTION 2

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

PROGRAM MANAGERS AND DOCUMENTATION

1. Direct Research and Development Testing and Evaluation

Program Managers: Dr. Clemens Meyer, CERD, (202) 761-1850, Ms. Eloisa Brown, CERD, 202-761-1834, Julio Arocho, CERD, 202-761-1849.

2. Direct OMA: Program Manager: Ms. Eloisa E. Brown, CERD-L, 202-761-1834, EMAP
Program Managers: Richard Herrmann, CEERD-TD, 703-428-6800.

3. Direct Civil: Program Manager: Ms. Isabel Sayers, CERD, 202-761-1837, Dr. Tony Liu, CERD, 202-761-0222, Mr. David Mathis, CERD, 202-761-1846

Program Managers Assessment: FY 03 – FY 05

The civil works R&D program continues to provide practical end products to enhance the efficiency of civil works planning, design, construction, operations and maintenance activities. Strategic R&D focus areas for FY 03-05 include sediment management, System-Wide Modeling, Assessment & Restoration Technologies (SMART), Technologies and Operational Innovations for Urban Watershed Networks (TOWNS), Common Delivery Framework, and Navigation/MTS2020.

The RDT&E program within the Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) continues to evolve to meet Army and Corps mission requirements in military engineering, battle space environment, environmental quality, and facility management. The ERDC maximizes its extensive and synergistic scientific and technical expertise to develop and execute well integrated programs that are responsive to customer requirements and to deliver quality products to the field. To that end, the ERDC has the following major objectives:

- . To deliver new technologies needed by USACE to achieve its strategic vision,
- . To increase the relevance of the Corps to its customers,
- . To increase the focus on priority future operational capabilities of the Nation and
- . To sustain world-class research capability in critical mission areas.

SECTION 2

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Engineer Research & Development Center (ERDC) (\$000)

	FY 02 Actual TOA From EPR	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05
Civil Works Direct				
GI	\$27,379	\$27,434	\$27,846	\$28,264
CG	\$2,515	\$2,553	\$2,591	\$2,630
O&M	\$20,370	\$20,533	\$20,841	\$21,154
GE & Other	\$16,526	\$8,862	\$14,383	\$19,282
Total CW Direct	\$66,790	\$59,382	\$65,661	\$71,330
Civil Works Reimbursable				
USACE Reimb (Corps to Corps)	\$94,416	\$0	\$0	\$0
Support for Others (Federal)	\$20,133	\$0	\$0	\$0
Support for Others (Non-Fed)				
HQUSACE				
Environ Restoration Spt				
Total CW Reimbursable	\$114,549	\$0	\$0	\$0
Direct Fund Cites	\$1,303	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Civil Works	\$182,642	\$59,382	\$65,661	\$71,330
Military Direct				
RDT&E Direct and Congressionals	\$114,218	\$106,349	\$108,067	\$109,576
OMA Direct	\$46,549	\$36,328	\$42,570	\$38,741
Other Mil Direct (MCA-Army, OPA, DOD, CTIS, Etc)	\$103,272	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Direct	\$264,039	\$142,677	\$150,637	\$148,317
Military R&D Reimbursable				
HQUSACE				
Corps to Corps				
Army, R&D, OMA, ETC	\$125,187	\$43,773	\$0	\$0
Other DOD				
Total Military Reimbursable	\$125,187	\$43,773	\$0	\$0
Direct Fund Cites	\$92,033	\$71,500	\$0	\$0
Total Military	\$481,259	\$257,950	\$150,637	\$148,317
Total ERDC	\$663,901	\$317,332	\$216,298	\$219,647

FY 02 Actual includes CEEIS Funding received by ITL.

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

HR REGIONALIZATION. HR Regionalization, begun in FY 96, requires budgeting for the costs of both regional Civilian Personnel Operations Centers (CPOC) and local Civilian Personnel Advisory Centers (CPAC). CPOC costs are billed by HQUSACE to Corps CONUS commands for their share of the HQDA-identified costs.

The CPOC bill includes operating costs (primarily salary and benefits for a portion of the CPOC staff). The basis for the CPOC charges is the percent each command's population represents of the total regional CPOC's serviced population. The table below does not display CPAC costs that cover required services that have not been assumed by the regional CPOC. Determination and payment of the CPAC costs is a local command operating budget process (whether the CPAC is Corps or another Army Command).

(Per employee serviced)			
ALL CPOC REGIONS	Rate FY 03	Rate FY 04	Rate FY 05
All CE Divisions/Districts/Centers/HQ	\$460	\$476	\$492

SECTION 4

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

USACE FINANCE CENTER (UFC) RATES

Furnished below are the estimated amounts that will be distributed to each site for operating finance and accounting support provided by the UFC during FY 03-05. In calculating these amounts, the UFC has utilized an algorithm developed to distribute the support cost in correlation with the volume of work performed in six categories (or functions). These categories are travel, accounts payable, accounts receivable/debt management, disbursing, cash reports, and field reports. Workload statistics have been compiled for each site to serve as a basis for distributing the support costs. In addition, the UFC applied a factor to these statistics for cash reports and field reports to reflect the amount of time devoted to civil versus military workload.

The UFC will bill actual costs incurred for FY 03, up to the amounts provided below for each respective site. For FY 03 the amounts below represent the maximum cost which will be billed to a particular site. Unlike previous years, in FY 03 the UFC will accept/record customer orders for support costs on its CEFMS database. **Therefore, each site must transmit government order(s) to the UFC for support costs in FY 03.**

In addition, amounts are provided for the four sites which are scheduled to consolidate to the UFC during FY 03, i.e. Pacific Ocean Division, Honolulu District, Japan District, and Far East District. For FY 03 the support costs for these sites have been prorated based on the projected consolidation date of 1 April 2003.

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>	<u>FY 05</u> (Est \$'s)
HUNTSVILLE	567,000	595,000	625,000
MISS. VALLEY DIV	62,000	65,000	68,000
MEMPHIS	171,000	180,000	189,000
NEW ORLEANS	350,000	367,000	386,000
ST. LOUIS	239,000	251,000	264,000
VICKSBURG	344,000	362,000	380,000
ROCK ISLAND	319,000	335,000	351,000
ST PAUL	230,000	241,000	254,000
NORTH ATLANTIC DIV	66,000	69,000	72,000
NEW YORK	501,000	526,000	552,000
NEW ENGLAND	437,000	459,000	482,000
BALTIMORE	931,000	977,000	1,026,000
WASH AQUEDUCT	41,000	43,000	45,000
NORFOLK	376,000	395,000	414,000
PHILADELPHIA	207,000	218,000	229,000
NORTHWESTERN DIV	86,000	90,000	95,000
PORTLAND	355,000	372,000	391,000
SEATTLE	494,000	519,000	545,000
WALLA WALLA	202,000	213,000	223,000

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

UFC RATES (CONT'D)

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>	<u>FY 05</u> (Est \$'s)
KANSAS CITY	607,000	638,000	670,000
OMAHA	916,000	961,000	1,009,000
GR LKS OH RIV DIV	54,000	56,000	59,000
HUNTINGTON	351,000	368,000	387,000
LOUISVILLE	881,000	925,000	971,000
NASHVILLE	312,000	327,000	344,000
PITTSBURGH	229,000	240,000	252,000
BUFFALO	129,000	136,000	143,000
CHICAGO	79,000	83,000	87,000
DETROIT	175,000	184,000	193,000
PACIFIC OCEAN DIV	30,000	42,000	44,000
FAR EAST	149,000	209,000	219,000
JAPAN	96,000	134,000	141,000
HONOLULU	201,000	281,000	295,000
ALASKA	370,000	388,000	407,000
SOUTH ATLANTIC DIV	67,000	70,000	73,000
CHARLESTON	89,000	94,000	98,000
JACKSONVILLE	405,000	425,000	446,000
MOBILE	1,084,000	1,138,000	1,195,000
SAVANNAH	741,000	778,000	817,000
WILMINGTON	212,000	222,000	233,000
SOUTH PACIFIC DIV	76,000	80,000	84,000
LOS ANGELES	485,000	509,000	534,000
SACRAMENTO	793,000	833,000	874,000
SAN FRANCISCO	121,000	127,000	134,000
ALBUQUERQUE	188,000	198,000	208,000
SOUTHWESTERN DIV	72,000	76,000	80,000
FORT WORTH	979,000	1,028,000	1,079,000
GALVESTON	148,000	156,000	163,000
LITTLE ROCK	467,000	490,000	515,000
TULSA	643,000	675,000	708,000
ERDC	998,000	1,048,000	1,100,000
WRSC	55,000	58,000	61,000
HQUSACE	425,000	446,000	468,000
HECSA	68,000	71,000	74,000
CPW	64,000	67,000	70,000
TAC	166,000	174,000	183,000
EUROPE	300,000	315,000	330,000
TOTALS	19,203,000	20,327,000	21,339,000

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)

Critical success for attaining Corporate Information goals and strategic direction set by the Chief of Engineers over the next few years can be defined as creating an environment that fully leverages Information Technology (IT) products and services throughout the Corps. The Corporate Information professional community must partner with business process owners to effectively provide the Corps team, as well as their customers & stakeholders, the right information - the right knowledge any time and any place - at the best value.

The Directorate of Corporate Information (DCI) staff, along with the Regional Chief Information Officers (CIO) and District CIOs must continue to forge effective partnerships with USACE functional areas and stakeholders to ensure that IT is strategically aligned to support business processes. This alignment is essential to accomplish interoperability, IT innovation, systems modernization (integration & reliability), information security, and capture of explicit and tacit organizational knowledge. We must pursue innovative and expeditious approaches to insert new IT while mitigating risk, reducing costs and distancing ourselves from lengthy contracting and development efforts. Economies of scale in building the USACE networked, multi-tier architecture must be a continual goal to enable the organization to reduce duplication and eliminate inefficiencies.

The four major IT initiatives below have been chosen to ensure our IT resources bring about a Return On Investment (ROI) that best supports the USACE Organization. These major IT initiatives are references from the FY 02-07 USACE IT Campaign Plan (Available: <http://www.usace.army.mil/ci/campaign-plan.pdf>).

Four Major IT Initiatives

Information Technology Architecture. Information technology (IT) decisions will be made based on our Corps Enterprise Architecture (CEA).

Information Assurance (IA). Maintaining Information Assurance (IA) vigilance remains a high priority that must be properly resourced at all levels.

Information Resources Management. Proactive stewardship of Information Resources will properly direct senior management's focus on optimizing IT investments and knowledge capital.

E-Government (E-Gov) Programs and Services. We must continue streamlining and redefining information delivery and the conduct of the Corps business with our customers, stakeholders, and citizens.

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

Emphasis: <u>District Level</u> <u>Regional Level</u> <u>Enterprise Level</u>	Four Major IT Initiatives			
	Information Technology Architecture	Information Assurance	Information Resources Management	E-Government Programs and Services
	●	●	●	●
	●	●	●	●
	●	●	●	●
Corporate Information Goals	Achieve highly effective IT infrastructure	Protect data, information, systems, and networks against unauthorized use, denial of service, and data/information destruction or change	Provide disciplined approach to selection, control and evaluation of IT investments	Identify and implement opportunities that use electronic means to provide information and services
	Reduce system development cost		Facilitate sharing of knowledge	
	Increase information delivery capabilities		Enable USACE employees to possess “personal knowledge capital” for successful development of IT	
			Promote successful development and operation of IT	
USACE Strategic Goals Supported: <u>People</u> <u>Processes</u> <u>Communications</u>	★ ★ ★	★ ★ ★	★ ★ ★	★ ★ ★

Information Technology Architecture. Information technology (IT) decisions will be made based on our Corps Enterprise Architecture (CEA).

Achieve a Highly Effective IT Infrastructure.

The Corps Enterprise Architecture (CEA) Framework provides USACE-specific building blocks required to support the Federal Enterprise Architecture Framework (FEAF) and the DOD's Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Information, Surveillance & Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Framework. We need to continue defining where our architecture needs to take us to meet future business goals, and then make the corporate investment decisions at all organizational levels to meet those goals. A disciplined project management approach must be applied to all IT modernization efforts. Use of prototypes and pilots should be encouraged. In FY 03 and FY 04, DCI will begin to conduct alignment synchronization with the

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

Federal Business Architecture to ensure shared development of common Federal processes, interoperability and sharing information at the Federal Agency level. The CEA web page provides up-to-date changes in architectural policy and procedures (Available: <https://cea.usace.army.mil/>).

The Corps of Engineers Enterprise Infrastructure Services (CEEIS) program provides the platform, computing power, information assurance (IA) and communications mechanisms necessary to support increasing customer demand for a premier worldwide Wide Area Network (WAN). CEEIS encompasses the USACE-wide communications network and two processing centers located at Vicksburg, MS and Portland, OR. It should be noted that Districts additionally provide extended WAN implementation and operational services to District-level projects and field locations. The CEEIS Configuration Control Board (CCB) continues to meet and evaluate configuration issues in FY 02. The revised charter includes the responsibilities and authorities to recommend Enterprise Level decision-making and information technology asset management support to DCI on behalf of CEEIS stakeholders and users. CEEIS CCB membership includes both HQS and field representation. In FY 03 and FY 04, CEEIS, at the Enterprise Level, will continue to improve IA, develop a Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) for USACE-wide Automated Information Systems (AIS). Costs for various levels of COOP will be presented to HQUSACE chain of command for approval and funding. In addition CEEIS will support the deployment of AIS like the Standard Procurement System (SPS) upgrade, Program and Project Management (P2), Facilities Equipment Management (FEM), etc. The CEEIS Program Manager will be asking every organizational element which has connectivity to the CEEIS network, as well as AIS which are hosted on CEEIS, to complete an MOA/MOU related to the CEEIS security accreditation process. CIOs at the Regional Level and District Level will be required to stay informed and assist with FY 03 CEEIS initiatives to provide a sound COOP, migrate to Windows 2000 software and corporate licensing of Oracle software. These initiatives will require collaboration and agreement from all levels of the organization. Up-to-date CEEIS products, services and procedures can be found at the CEEIS web page (Available: <https://www.ceeis.usace.army.mil/>).

CIOs at the Regional Level and District Level will move their desktops to the Windows 2000® (WIN2K) level before 30 Sep 02 and their servers to the WIN2K Server level by 30 Sep 2003. The Ft. Monmouth contract is available to assist in procuring the software. Up-to-date WIN2K information can be found at the WIN2K web page (Available: <https://windows2000.usace.army.mil/>).

Regional and District CIOs will be required to pay particular attention to the Department of Defense (DoD) requirement to implement Common Access Cards (CAC) and Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) by end of FY 03. The CAC will replace the current series of paper Standard Identification Cards. CAC will be also be used as the access card for facilities and controlled

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

spaces. PKI will provide a cryptographic infrastructure that supports key, privilege and certificate management and will enable positive identification to individuals using network resources. This new process will replace the CEFMS card used today. A draft DoD CAC/PKI implementation plan has been drafted and will be distributed to all USACE sites as soon as it is available.

Planning is underway for USACE-wide Electronic Document Management System (EDMS) standards. Business, functional and technical requirements are still being identified. Affordability of this IT investment is the current challenge. In the interim, Regional Level and District Level CIOs should be enforcing standards prescribed in AR 25-400-2 and appendices and DoD 5015.2-STD, Design Criteria for Records Management Applications.

The Department of the Army (DA) classified SECRET Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET) typically supports CINCS, intelligence-related (S2) activities, war-room planning, deployment, transportation, and emergency operations activities. Regional Level and District Level organization are required to provide the necessary facilities (secure room) to house a RED LAN. DCI will provide funding at the Enterprise Level for all locations, which includes initial costs for standard connectivity, secure devices, AIS, operating systems, applications, accessories and other associated devices, software and hardware. DCI will also provide contract support for operating and maintaining systems administration. Cost estimates for providing the necessary facilities are:

SIPRNET	FY 02 Estimate 34,160	FY 03 Estimate 34,160	FY 04 Estimate 34,160	FY 05 Estimate 34,160
---------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

Long-Haul Communications. The CEEIS PM, Regional Level CIOs and District Level CIOs operate and maintain long-haul communications lines, equipment, and services that are acquired from the Defense Communications Service (DCS). This includes Defense Information System Network (DISN), Satellite Communications, Wireless Communications, Secret Internet Protocol Network (SIPRNET), Non Classified Internet Protocol Network (NIPRNET), National Security/Emergency Preparedness (NS/EP) Telecommunications Service Priority (TSP) System, Defense Data Network (DDN), Defense Message System (DMS), Defense Switched Network (DSN), Wide Area Telecommunications System (WATS), and Federal Telecommunications System (FTS) Switched Voice Service (SVS). Regional Level and District Level CIOs order, for their own commands, the long-haul communications lines, equipment, and services appropriate to their command's requirements; however, **it is the HQUSACE (DCI) that pays a**

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

consolidated bill from DCS on a quarterly basis for what each command acquires. Consequently, each command must remit to HQUSACE (instructions by separate memorandum) the funds needed to pay this consolidated bill. Commands are to use their current and past FY costs to estimate their FY 03-05 funding requirements for the long-haul communications lines, equipment, and services their plan on acquiring and/or sustaining. Each command must program, plan and budget for their long-haul communications requirements so as be able to remit to HQUSACE the funds needed. The request for remittance for the FY 03 first quarter payment will be made in later October or early November. The estimated consolidated bill for the long-haul communications lines, equipment, and services by commands is as follows:

Long-haul Communications	FY 02 Estimate	FY 03 Estimate	FY 04 Estimate	FY 05 Estimate
	1.3M	1.5M	2.M	2.5M

The USACE Engineering Research and Development Center (ERDC) Tele-Engineering Operations Center (TEOC) provides a civil and environmental engineering tele-presence when specialized engineer expertise is required to resolve problems and technical advice is needed. The ERDC TEOC provides the link between deployed personnel and a team of subject matter experts (SMEs) with the required computational assets to provide requested analyses without deploying the SME into the theater. Regional Level and District Level CIOs should keep their staffs informed and support requirements for secure communications between the TEOC and supported engineer units, through coordination with the National Security Agency (NSA), the ERDC developed secure communications capable of video-teleconferencing (VTC) and data transfer. There are three major components of this system: 1) the multipoint secure VTC hub, 2) the satellite-based deployable communications package, and 3) the ISDN line-based fixed-site communications package.

DCI is partnering with other Major Army Commands for access to Oracle software licenses under a new, Army-sponsored enterprise contract. Under this new contract, those presently holding Oracle licenses external to CEEIS will have to cover the cost of maintenance beginning in FY 03. Details of this enterprise Oracle contract will be published separately.

DCI has a new IT Services Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) that is available to all Corps Districts, Centers, Laboratories, Divisions, and HQ Principals. This new contract is available across the Corps and includes a range of contractors from small disadvantaged businesses to large companies. The contract is an authorized Federal Supply Service Schedule under GSA and is valid for five years.

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

Reduce System Development Cost.

The CEA is the first step toward providing a Common Operating Environment (COE). In FY 03 and FY 04, a gathering and sharing of sound technology development, best software engineering/project management practices and providing a test environment will occur at the Enterprise Level. A COE certification process will be established to assist improvements at the Regional Level and District Levels. Chief Information Officers (CIO), functional proponents and material developers will be required to comply with COE certification, apply COE technologies and standards, track and demonstrate reduced development costs. Major Subordinate Commands and below should be actively participating in Milestone Decisions within their level of authority (Reference ER 25-1-2). Part of MDA responsibility is looking at opportunities for system streamlining & reductions at all organizational levels.

Increase Information Delivery Capabilities

USACE Commander's Challenge (FY 02 Kansas City IT Conference): *Proactively providing readiness and redundancy in our command and control systems is critical.*

Our ability to provide a robust corporate network and information delivery infrastructure will quickly be reflected in user satisfaction related to availability of IT tools and dependability of services. CIOs at the Regional Level and District Level must conduct individual assessments and plan for upgrades, as necessary, for computing and communications network needs at the District level and below.

Information Assurance. Maintaining Information Assurance (IA) vigilance remains a high priority that must be properly resourced at all levels.

USACE Commander's Challenge (FY 02 Kansas City IT Conference): *Maintain vigilance over our technology infrastructure, down to the very last personal workstation in the remotest of our area offices.*

Protect Data, Information, Systems, and Networks Against Unauthorized Use, Denial of Service, and Data/Information Destruction or Change.

We rely on our Information Systems and Data Communication Networks in the performance of our critical civil and military missions. The CEEIS Program Management Office is working on an overall enterprise Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP), including the COOP capabilities required by corporate systems that run within the CEEIS production environment. The nucleus of COOP capabilities required by corporate systems must be available in FY 03.

An automated tool has been purchased by DCI, which is helpful in completing the DITSCAP documentation. For more information see <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/training.html>.

In the current information technical environment, there is no easy secret to total information systems security. We must implement security on multiple tiers inside our organization with the cooperation of the whole team. The tasks below identify ways to protect and maximize computer resources:

- Comply with the DoD Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP). Specific information may be found at <https://iase.disa.mil/ditscap/DitscapFrame.html>.
 - Divisions/Districts must have valid accreditation packages on their LAN, local AIS, and the systems they maintain. The Designated Approving Authority (DAA), the Commander, will approve accreditation requests. (See Letter of Delegation of Authority <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/ditscap.html>)
 - Corps of Engineers Enterprise Infrastructure Services (CEEIS) must have a valid accreditation package on the WAN, to include the two processing centers, and the systems they maintain (i.e., UPASS). The USACE CIO is the DAA and will approve the CEEIS accreditation.
 - Corps-wide, AIS Functional Proponents must submit accreditation packages for the systems, i.e., CEFMS, they develop/maintain to the USACE DAA, the USACE CIO, for approval.
- Network Based Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS) are required at all entrances and gateways to the CEEIS wide area and local area communications networks.
 - Corps sites (Divisions, Centers, Labs, Districts, and FOAs) will ensure all outside connections (non-Corps connections) at their site have IDS. CEEIS will monitor the IDS information for these connections. Where possible, this information will also be provided to the sites.
 - CEEIS will provide a VPN infrastructure in support of external access including telework and contract support activities.
 - CEEIS will verify that all corporate gateways have IDS. CEEIS will also maintain and monitor all corporate firewalls and all IDS devices. (Local sites may have the ability to read these mandatory devices where the software supports read only access).

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

- Army Policy requires host-based Intrusion Detection Systems, IDS, on Information Assurance Servers that support dial-in systems (RADIUS compliant server) and on all mission critical systems. A server is critical if the loss of the server will severely impact the command's ability to perform its mission.
 - Divisions, Centers, Labs, Districts, and FOAs will add host-based IDS to mission critical servers including dial-in servers.
 - CEEIS will install IDS on all critical processing center servers. CEEIS will monitor all mandatory IDS devices.
 - The E-mail Center of Expertise will install IDS on all critical mail servers.
 - Functional proponents who do not process their applications, including web-based or enabled, at the CEEIS processing centers will install IDS on all their critical servers.
 - The Internet Center of Expertise (ICE) will install IDS on all critical web servers.
- Mandatory DoD and DA Information Assurance training is documented at: <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/training.html>
 - All locations will complete all mandatory training and maintain all IA personnel at certification level II. Recertification will be accomplished on an annual basis, by either attending an IA workshop or if travel funds are short, completing one of the IA educational CDs at: <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/cdtrain.html>
 - Divisions, Centers, Labs, Districts and FOA's will plan to send Systems Administrators (SA), working on Windows 2000 servers, to the DA SA course for Windows 2000 security. Tuition will be paid for by DA, units must fund for TDY and travel.
 - CEEIS, the E-Mail Center, ICE and the functional proponents will complete all mandatory training, to include Windows 2000 security training. There are no easy solutions for total information system security. We must implement security on multiple tiers inside our organization with the cooperation of the whole team. Proponents for civil and military missions must determine security risks and implement critical system security devices and practices. For up-to-date information on AIS security issues see <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/>. Compliance with DoD Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP). Up-to-date-information can be found at <https://iase.disa.mil/ditscap/DitscapFrame.html>.

Information Resources Management. Proactive stewardship of Information Resources will properly direct senior management's focus on optimizing IT investments and knowledge capital.

Provide Disciplined Approach to Selection, Control and Evaluation of IT Investments.

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

USACE Commander's Challenge (FY 02 Kansas City IT Conference): *We need folks engaged at all levels – Headquarters and the field, to put rigor to our information technology investment control and evaluation processes.*

We must strengthen capital planning and investment control to maximize the value and manage the risks of IT acquisitions. Once approved, the investment in any IT business case must be measured and benefits tracked. During FY 03 and FY 04, the USACE IT Capital Planning and Investment Decision (CPID) process at the Enterprise Level will be brought in line with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidelines, including the identification of the enterprise portfolio of *Major IT Initiatives* (as defined by OMB). CIOs at the Regional Level and the District Level must implement a similar IT Investment Decision Process at their respective levels which focuses on tracking costs and considering value and risk of each investment – as well as understanding the direction of the CEA before making each investment. The IT Investment Portfolio System (ITIPS) will be the primary source of financial and investment information used in future IT investment decisions at all levels.

Prioritizing IT investments in FY 03 and FY 04 should give special consideration for corporate-wide systems that eliminate and/or consolidate less efficient systems. Program and Project Management (P2) will begin deployment in FY 03 and will replace several legacy systems like PROMIS and PPDS. Desktop standards for training (related to the overarching Program and Project Management Business Process) and P2 deployment schedule can be found at <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/liaison/pmbp.html>. Up-to-date information on deployment of IT systems and programs can be found at <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/liaison/liaisonais.html>.

Facilitate Sharing of Knowledge.

USACE Commander's Challenge (FY 02 Kansas City IT Conference): *Help create our learning organization.*

DCI has responsibility for leading efforts related to creating a knowledge-based culture through practical applications of Knowledge Management (KM). A part of this responsibility is ensuring that enterprise portal technology is used effectively to support “vertical” community-specific initiatives and appropriately integrated within the overall enterprise portal framework. Portal technology enhances the Command's ability to share its structured and unstructured information resources, as well as promote expertise and knowledge sharing among the Corps workforce. Enterprise Level functional proponents and senior staffs responsible for core business processes should work closely with DCI to assess needs for enterprise portal

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

technology in FY 03 and FY 04. A business case and action plan should follow as appropriate. Regional Level and District Level functional program managers should work with Regional and District CIOs to assess unique KM requirements, develop a business case and action plan to implement KM portals as appropriate. Use of Army Knowledge On-Line (AKO), and the building of enterprise content via AKO is encouraged.

Enable USACE Employees to Possess “Personal Knowledge Capital” for Successful Development of IT.

CIOs at Enterprise Level, Regional Level and District Level should actively participate in their organization’s IT initiatives and advise their commanders, command staffs, and Capable Workforce teams on/about what leadership, management, supervisory and technical education and training is required to execute the missions and functions assigned the IT organization. As a minimum, all commands should encourage their Directors/Chiefs of Information Management to complete the Advanced Management Program or CIO Certificate Program at the National Defense University’s IRM College. Knowledge Management courses at the IRM college are also highly recommended. This is a mandatory DoD requirement for GS-13 and above IT professionals serving in CIO (i.e., IM/IT) positions. Individuals appointed to information assurance (IA) positions (IA Program Manager, IA Manager, IA Officer, IA Security Officer, IA Network Security Officers, and System Administrators) must complete required certification training appropriate to their appointment. Also, all information system users and operators must complete DISA’s Infosec Awareness training (available on CD). (Reference USACE IA website: <http://pso24.pso.usace.army.mil:1700/security/home.html>).

Promote Successful Development and Operation of IT.

Business Program Managers must identify and prioritize “what needs to be done” in terms of business functions and performance goals. CIOs at the Enterprise Level, Regional Level and District Level serve as the technical expert to assist in identifying how information technology can be applied to achieve results while maintaining efficient and effective information technology operations throughout USACE. In collaboration, the business area sponsor and the CIO staffs are expected to work closely to determine project cost, benefits and risks. The formal participation of IT professionals on Integrated Product Teams (IPTs) is encouraged.

E-Government (E-Gov) Programs and Services. We must continue streamlining and redefining information delivery and the conduct of the Corps business with our customers, stakeholders, and citizens.

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

Identify and Implement Opportunities that Use Electronic Means to Provide Information and Services.

USACE Commander's Challenge (FY 02 Kansas City IT Conference): *Be a proactive partner with your Commander and business areas in identifying and implementing a Corps electronic-government business environment.*

All organizational levels should have government-to-business, government-to-government, and government-to-citizen streamlining goals. In FY 03 at the Enterprise Level, DCI will coordinate an E-Gov Task Force to identify all means practical for implementing the President's E-Government initiative. Regional Level CIOs will be the primary members and assume lead roles in USACE E-Gov efforts. The E-Gov Task Force will identify priority actions to achieve strategic improvements in *Service to Individuals*, *Service to Businesses*, *Intergovernmental Reporting* and *Internal Efficiencies and Effectiveness*. In FY 03 and FY 04 timeframe, the Task Force will conduct a survey to identify additional transactions to be provided electronically to the public and other Federal Agencies. In addition the USACE task force will collaborate with KM.gov and the Federal CIO Council to draw on the lessons learned and best practices established through other e-government initiatives. The Internet will be used to support a high volume of citizen-required information that is provided to and collected at the District-level. Examples include collaboration with research centers and universities, providing computer-based training for employees, and connectivity with regional personnel centers.

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

MILITARY PROGRAMS STANDARD DEFINITIONS

1. **PROGRAM CATEGORIES.** Military Programs views construction and construction related programs in the categories identified below.

FUNDS TYPE GROUPS

<u>Direct (D) or Reimbursable (R)</u>	<u>Military (M) or Civil (C) Appropriation</u>	<u>Description</u>
D	M	Military Direct, Army
D	M	Military Direct, Air Force
D	M	Military Direct, DoD Agencies
D & R	M	Military Environmental
R	M	Military Reimbursable, O&MA
R	M	Military Reimbursable, O&M, Air Force
R	M	Military Reimbursable, DoD (Work for Others)
D & R	M & C	Special Management Programs
R	M	Military Reimbursable, Non-Federal
R	C	Civil Reimbursable, Environmental Interagency and International Services
R	C & M	Civil or Military Reimbursable, Interagency and International Services

2. **DIRECT FUNDING.** Military Construction (MILCON) funds are generally provided to USACE on a Funding Authorization Document (FAD) or a Treasury Warrant. The MILCON and other direct funds are allocated to USACE activities through the issuance of FADs.

3. **REIMBURSABLE FUNDING.** Funds that are provided by non-USACE activities are provided on a Military Interdepartmental Purchase Request (MIPR) or comparable document. Examples include MIPRs received from other Major Commands, Army Major Subordinate Commands (MSC), and installations as well as DoD elements. The funds are used primarily for operations and maintenance, repair, or environmental work and Interagency and International Services by Federal and non-Federal agencies for major construction, operations and maintenance, rehabilitation, repair projects and engineering services.

4. **CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUNDS TYPE GROUPS AND TYPE FUNDS.** The Major Program Categories identified in paragraph 1.a. are further divided into Type Funds (TF) as published in the Corps' standard Project Management Information System (PROMIS).

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

Following is a list of all TFs. The HQUSACE Proponent (CEMP-MP) is responsible for coordinating the issuance of TFs listed. Requests for additional fund type designations should be addressed to the CEMP-MP, ATTN: PROMIS PM.

TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

TF	ABBR	HQ PROPONENT	DESCRIPTION
72	SCGNT	CEMP-N	CONSTRUCTION GRANTS
73	SHUD	CEMP-N	HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
1T*	SDPW	CEMP-IS	RPMA SUPPORT TO DIRECTORATES OF PUBLIC WORKS (NEW)
04	BCD1	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE PROGRAM, PART I, OTHER
09	BCD2	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE PROGRAM, PART II, OTHER
1V	BUP	CEMP-MA	BARRACKS UPGRADE PROGRAM – O&M ARMY FUNDED
96	EEAP	CEMP-MA	ENERGY ENGINEERING ANALYSIS PROGRAM
5V	ECAS	CEMP-MA	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
10	MCA	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY
11	MMCA	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY, MINOR
32	NMCR	CEMP-MA	NAVY AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE
1R	OMARR	CEMP-MA	OP & MAINT, ARMY RESERVE REIMBURSABLE
18	OMAR	CEMP-MA	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE
Z3	QOLEA	CEMP-MA	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, AF
2S	AFSM	CEMP-MA	SMALL MISSILE CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE
63	PIK	CEMP-MA	PAYMENT IN KIND
84	RDAF	CEMP-MA	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALU, AIR FORCE
83	RDTA	CEMP-MA	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALU, ARMY
0B	BCF3	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE PART III, AIR FORCE
0A	BCA3	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE PART III, ARMY (BRAC93)
0C	BCA4	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, ARMY (BRAC95)
03	BCF1	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, PART I, AIR FORCE
02	BCA1	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, PART I, ARMY (BRAC I)
08	BCF2	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, PART II, AIR FORCE
07	BCA2	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, PART II, ARMY(BRAC91)
0D	BCF4	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, PART IV, AIR FORCE
1B	ECIF	CEMP-MA	ENERGY CONSERV INVESTMT PROG, AIR FORCE
1A	ECIP	CEMP-MA	ENERGY CONSERV INVESTMT PROG, ARMY
44	FHEC	CEMP-MA	FAMILY HOUSING - ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM
26	FHAF	CEMP-MA	FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE
42	FHLI	CEMP-MA	FAMILY HOUSING, LINE ITEM IMPROVEMENT

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

TF	ABBR	HQ PROPONENT	DESCRIPTION
40	FHNC	CEMP-MA	FAMILY HOUSING, NEW CONSTRUCTION
4A	MCDA	CEMP-MA	MIL CONSTR DEFENSE ACCOUNT (CHEM DEMIL)
6	MMCR	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTR, ARMY RESERVES, MINOR
20	MCAF	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE
21	MAFR	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVES
23	MMAF	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE, MINOR
25	MANG	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL
12	MCAR	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVES
27	NAAF	CEMP-MA	NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS, AIR FORCE
60	NAFA	CEMP-MA	NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS, ARMY
15	PBS	CEMP-MA	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT
4C	QOLED	CEMP-MA	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, DEFENSE
2A	QOLEA	CEMP-MA	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENT, AIR FORCE
4T	CTR	CEMP-MD	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION
W6	SDCPS	CEMP-MD	DC PUBLIC SCHOOLS
54	DLA	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
W5	SDMDC	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE MANPOWER DATA CTR
57	DNA	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY(MILCON)*
1U	DERF	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE EMERGENCY RELIEF FUND
Z2	DODO	CEMP-MD	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AGENCIES
51	DODS	CEMP-MD	DOD DEPENDENT SCHOOLS (MILCON)
91	EAPS	CEMP-MD	ENGINEER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, SAUDI
W7	SGAO	CEMP-MD	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
W8	SHOLM	CEMP-MD	HOLOCAUST MUSEUM
W9	SKENC	CEMP-MD	KENNEDY CENTER
1M	MGLV	CEMP-MD	MAGNETIC LEVITATION
22	MAPF	CEMP-MD	MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, AIR FORCE
5S	S6S	CEMP-MD	MILITARY CONSTR, SECTION 6 SCHOOLS-CONUS
30	MCN	CEMP-MD	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY
4B	BMDO	CEMP-MD	NAT'L MISSILE DEFENSE (BALLISTIC MISSILE)
56	DMA	CEMP-MD	NATIONAL IMAGING & MAPPING AGENCY(MILCON)*
69	NSA	CEMP-MD	NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY (MILCON)
1P	PRP	CEMP-MD	PENTAGON RENOVATION PROGRAM
66	SAH	CEMP-MD	US SOLDIERS' AND AIRMEN'S HOME
58	DCA	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

TF	ABBR	HQ PROPONENT	DESCRIPTION
4D	SDMDC	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE MANPOWER DATA CENTER
1S	SOCM	CEMP-MD	MILCON, SOUTHERN COMMAND (PANAMA)
85	RDTD	CEMP-MD	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALU, DOD
WY	SONGV	CEMP-MD	ALL NON-GOVERNMENT ENTITIES
WX	SOOTH	CEMP-MD	ALL OTHER FED DEPARTMENTS & AGENCIES
16	ANC	CEMP-MD	ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY
53	CEETA	CEMP-MD	COMMUN ELECTRONIC EVAL & TESTING AGENCY
39	MDOD	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE AGENCY (DOD), UNSPECIFIED MINOR
98	DECA	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY (MILCON)
48	DLI	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
WL	SODOE	CEMP-MD	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
WJ	SODOI	CEMP-MD	DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR
WK	SODOJ	CEMP-MD	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF PRISONS
WI	SODOS	CEMP-MD	DEPARTMENT OF STATE
W4	SOFDA	CEMP-MD	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND DRUG ADMIN
WM	SONPS	CEMP-MD	DEPT OF INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
W3	SOINS	CEMP-MD	DEPT OF JUSTICE, IMMIG & NATURALIZATION
WZ	SODOT	CEMP-MD	DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION, U.S. COAST GUARD
41	DFAS	CEMP-MD	DOD DEFENSE FINANCE ACCOUNTING SYSTEM
46	DODM	CEMP-MD	DOD MEDICAL FACILITIES
43	DODU	CEMP-MD	DOD MEDICAL FACILITIES, UNSPECIFIED MINOR
4S	SOF	CEMP-MD	DOD SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCE
WW	SOEMA	CEMP-MD	FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
WT	SOFG	CEMP-MD	FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS
70	FMS	CEMP-MD	FOREIGN MILITARY SALES
WA	SHGSA	CEMP-MD	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
3Q	GOCQ	CEMP-MD	GOVERNMENT OF KUWAIT FUNDED CONSTR
WP	SOVOA	CEMP-MD	INTERNAT'L COMMUNICATION AGENCY (VOA)
1K	KWM	CEMP-MD	KOREAN WAR MEMORIAL
13	MAP	CEMP-MD	MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
W2	SONAS	CEMP-MD	NATIONAL AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE ADMIN
WS	SOSLG	CEMP-MD	STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
55	DOE	CEMP-NE	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
W1	SOFHA	CEMP-NE	FARM SERVICES AGENCY

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

TF	ABBR	HQ PROPONENT	DESCRIPTION
76	GOJ	CEMP-NE	GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN
77	GOK	CEMP-NE	GOVERNMENT OF KOREA
3J	GOJC	CEMP-NE	GOVT OF JAPAN FUNDED CONSTRUCTION
6A	HN	CEMP-NE	HOST NATION, JAPAN
17	ARNG	CEMP-NE	MILITARY CONSTR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
50	NASA	CEMP-NE	NATIONAL AERONAUTICS & ADMINISTRATION
1N	NWM	CEMP-NE	NATIONAL WAR MEMORIAL
52	NATO	CEMP-NE	NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION
59	ONDF	CEMP-NE	OTHER NON-DEFENSE FEDERAL FUNDS
1C	USCG	CEMP-NE	US COAST GUARD
47	VOA	CEMP-NE	VOICE OF AMERICA
XD	SABMC	CEMP-NE	AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION
WE	SOARD	CEMP-NE	APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
WZ	SODOT	CEMP-NE	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (US COAST GUARD)
XA	SDOA	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE
XB	SDOC	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF COMMERCE
XF	SBIA	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS SFO
XE	SFWL	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE SFO
XG	SDEA	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF JUSTICE, DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
WQ	SFBE	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF JUSTICE, FED BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS SFO
XH	SFAA	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMIN SFO
WR	SDOTR	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF TREASURY, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
B1	FUSR	CEMP-NE	FORMERLY USED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM
WF	SHUD	CEMP-NE	HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE SFO
WN	SOIBC	CEMP-NE	INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION
XC	SSMTH	CEMP-NE	SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTE
86	SMPF	CEMP-NE	STATE, MUNICIPALITY AND PRIVATE FUNDS
5U	FUDS	CEMP-RF	DERP, FORMERLY USED DEF SITES (FUDS) DIRECT
5H	BA1E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART I, ARMY (BRAC I) DIRECT
5A	IRPAD	CEMP-RI	DERP, ARMY INST RESTORATN PROG (IRP), DIRECT
5G	IRPAR	CEMP-RI	DERP, ARMY IRP, REIMB
5L	EQ	CEMP-RI	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REIMBURSIBLE
5P	BF1E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART I, AIR FORCE, DIRECT
5Q	BF2E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART II, AIR FORCE, DIRECT

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

TF	ABBR	HQ PROPONENT	DESCRIPTION
5I	BA2E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART II, ARMY (BRAC91) DIRECT
5R	BF3E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART III, AIR FORCE, DIRECT
5J	BA3E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART III, ARMY(BRAC93) DIRECT
5T	BF4E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART IV, AIR FORCE, DIRECT
5K	BA4E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART IV, ARMY(BRAC95) DIRECT
5E	C2PF	CEMP-RI	COMPLI, CONSERV & POL PREV, AF, REIMB
5C	C2PA	CEMP-RI	COMPLI, CONSERV AND POLLUTION PREV, REIMB
5F	IRPFR	CEMP-RI	DERP, AIR FORCE IRP, REIMB
5D	IRPLR	CEMP-RI	DERP, DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY IRP, REIMB
5B	IRPOR	CEMP-RI	DERP, OTHER IRP, REIMB
V1	HGSA	CEMP-RS	ENVIRONMENTAL FOR GEN SERVICES ADMIN
WD	EPAO	CEMP-RS & NE	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, OTHER
V3	HTRE	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
VF	HCCC	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORP
VG	HFSA	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE, FARM SERVICE AGENCY
VZ	HAFS	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE, FOREST SERVICE
VA	HEDA	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF COMMERCE, ECON. DEVPMNT ADMIN
VL	HDOE	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF ENERGY
VK	HHHS	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
VB	HBIA	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
VC	HBLM	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MGMT
VX	HIBR	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
VY	HIFW	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
VD	HNPS	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
VT	HJBP	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF PRISONS
VU	HJFBI	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF JUSTICE, FED BUREAU INVESTIGATION
VV	HJINS	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION & NATURALIZATION
VH	HFAA	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF TRANSPORT, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMIN
VJ	HFRA	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF TRANSPORT, FEDERAL RAILWAY ADMIN
VI	HCG	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION, U.S. COAST GUARD
WH	EPACG	CEMP-RS & NE	EPA CONSTRUCTION GRANTS PROGRAMS
WU	SUPF	CEMP-RS & NE	EPA SUPERFUND
WG	HEPA	CEMP-RS & NE	EPA, EXCEPT CONSTR GRANTS & SUPERFUND
VP	HFDIC	CEMP-RS & NE	FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

TF	ABBR	HQ PROPONENT	DESCRIPTION
VN	HFEMA	CEMP-RS & NE	FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
V5	HFDA	CEMP-RS & NE	FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION
V4	HGAO	CEMP-RS & NE	GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING OFFICE
V2	HHUD	CEMP-RS & NE	HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
V6	HIHS	CEMP-RS & NE	INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE
VS	HNOAA	CEMP-RS & NE	NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMIN
VM	HPHS	CEMP-RS & NE	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
VQ	HSBA	CEMP-RS & NE	SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
VR	HUSPS	CEMP-RS & NE	UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
2F	AFF	NONE	AIR FORCE FURNITURE DESIGN AND PROCUREMENT
62	FRGA	NONE	ALTERNATE CONSTRUCTION, GERMANY
1F	ARMF	NONE	ARMY FURNITURE DESIGN AND PROCUREMENT
64	AFES	NONE	ARMY/AIR FORCE EXCHANGE HQ
65	AFEL	NONE	ARMY/AIR FORCE EXCHANGE, LOCAL
29	BOMAF	NONE	BRAC O&M, AIR FORCE
6C	CDIP	NONE	COMBINED DEFENSE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
3N	DBON	NONE	DEFENSE BUSINESS O FUND (NAVY/MC)
3F	DBOF	NONE	DEFENSE BUSINESS OP FUND (AIR FORCE)
3A	DBOA	NONE	DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND(ARMY)
3D	DBOD	NONE	DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND(DEFENSE)
61	DFIRA	NONE	DEFENSE OVERSEAS MIL FAC, INVEST RECOV ACCOUNT
4M	DMOM	NONE	DOD MEDICAL FACILITIES, OPER AND MAINT
5M	OMS	NONE	DOD SCHOOLS, OPERATIONS AND MAINT
6B	FIP	NONE	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
45	FHMA	NONE	FAMILY HOUSING - MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR
3C	FHRN	NONE	FAMILY HOUSING - O&M REPAIR, NAVY
2M	FHMF	NONE	FAMILY HOUSING, O+M, AIR FORCE
Z1	MOSF	NONE	MODERNIZATION OF U.S. FACILITIES, GERMANY
5N	AFN	NONE	NATO, AIR FORCE
35	NAFN	NONE	NON APPROPRIATED FUNDS (NAVY)
82	NALF	NONE	NON-APPROPRIATED ARMY, LOCAL
24	OMAF	NONE	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE
14	OMA	NONE	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY
49	OMD	NONE	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DOD

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

TF	ABBR	HQ PROPONENT	DESCRIPTION
33	OMN	NONE	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY/MC
28	OTHF	NONE	OTHER AIR FORCE FUNDS
19	OTHA	NONE	OTHER ARMY FUNDS
31	OTHN	NONE	OTHER NAVY FUNDS (HOST NATION)
3G	RPMF	NONE	REAL PROPERTY MAINT, DEFENSE(AIR F)
3E	RPMD	NONE	REAL PROPERTY MAINT, DEFENSE(DEFENSE)
3P	RPMN	NONE	REAL PROPERTY MAINT, DEFENSE(NAVY/MC)
3K	ROKC	NONE	REPUBLIC OF KOREA FUNDED CONSTRUCTION
6E	SACO	NONE	SPECIAL ACTION COMMAND ON OKINAWA
99	TSAL	NONE	TROOP SUPPORT AGENCY, LOCAL
3B	RPMA	NONE	REAL PROPERTY MAINT, DEFENSE(ARMY)

5. The following is the current definition for Interagency and International Services (IIS) (formerly known as Support for Others (SFO)/Work for Others (WFO)) for use in Classifying Work and PROMIS Data Input and Reporting:

Interagency and International Services (IIS) Program (formerly known as Support for Others (SFO)/Work for Others (WFO)): Reimbursable assistance provided by USACE to non-Department of Defense (DOD) Federal agencies (EPA, FEMA, etc. and associated Real Estate support.), State and Local Governments, Native American Nations, U.S. Territorial Governments, U.S. Private Firms, International Organizations and Foreign Governments.

By exclusion, any work that falls outside the Corps' Civil, Military or Real Estate core missions listed below will be classified as IIS.

Civil Works Programs

Acronym

Civil Works Construction General	CWCG
Civil Engineering and General Investigation	CEGI
Civil Works Operations and Maintenance	CW O&M
Formerly Used Sites, Remedial Action Program	FUSRAP
Mississippi River and Tributaries	MR&T
Regulatory and Emergency	Reg/Emerg
Civil Works Research, Development, Technology and Evaluation	CW RDT&E

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

Interagency and International Services (IIS) Definition (Cont'd)

<u>Military Programs</u>	<u>Acronym</u>
Major Military Construction <i>(BRAC, Army, Air Force, DoD, Navy, NMD, Chemical Demilitarization, etc.)</i>	MILCON
Department of Defense Reimbursable <i>(O&M, FH O&M, NAF, DLA, AFES, PBS, MAP, NSA, CTR, etc., etc.)</i>	DoD Reimb.
Installation Support	IS (Inst. Spt.)
Formerly Utilized Defense Sites	FUDS
Installation Restoration	IR
Foreign Military Sales/Other Security Assistance	FMS
Host Nation Support <i>(Japan, Korea, Europe and NATO)</i>	HNS
Military Research, Development, Technology and Evaluation	MIL RDT&E
Defense Burden Sharing (Kuwait, etc.)	---
<u>Real Estate</u>	<u>Acronym</u>
Home Owners Assistance Program	HAP
Army and Civil Works Real Estate	RE Support
Department of Defense Recruitment	DoD Recruit.

Detailed guidance on accepting and performing IIS work is provided in ER 1140-1-211. Questions on the classification of work as IIS may be addressed to Mr. James Lovo, CEMP-NI, 202-761-0052 or the POC for the definition, Mr. Phil Pinol, CEMP-MP, 202-761-1321.

SECTION 3

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

MILITARY PROGRAMS INSTALLATION SUPPORT (IS) PROGRAM (RPMA Support to Directorates of Public Works)

1. DA funding guidance for the direct-funded portion of Installation Support increases overall direct-funded program 4% in FY 03, 4.0% in FY 04, and 4.0% in FY 05 for labor.
2. The USACE Installation Support Program is an integrated mix of direct and reimbursable funds. MSCs have the responsibility to build an integrated program providing both regional and customer specific support, using both direct and reimbursable funds.
3. Per HQ direction, direct funding to MVD for a PM-Forward at Rock Island Arsenal phased out at the end of FY 02. The intent of funding \$100,000 to MVD in previous years was to assist in the RI District/RIA DPW test. This test was concluded at the end of FY 99.
4. The Commander's goal is to have a PM forward at each major Army installation. However, command resources do not allow funding of this goal on the short term. Priority focus of the PM-Forward activities should be to place PM-Forwards at those installations that are Power Projection Platforms, Power Support Platforms and those OMA-funded installations that will have a Stryker IBCT or Objective Force at the installation.
5. To the maximum extent possible, all checkbook funds should be allocated during the 1st and 2nd quarters to provide adequate execution rates and development of an execution plan that meets Army customer needs. Manpower funds will be allocated quarterly. All installation support funds will be allocated at the appropriate AMSCO level.
6. Installation Support direct funds are regional assets. Work accomplished by districts, using MSC installation support funds will have appropriate district overhead applied to the work. Regional support and integration of installation support are MSC missions and will be treated as such in the application of overhead rates.
7. Use of Installation Support Funds:
 - It is appropriate for all IS personnel to provide "baseline support" to any customer.
 - Any OMA funded customer and project may receive services funded by the IS Checkbook funds or directly from IS personnel.
 - All non-OMA customers/projects may only receive baseline support on a non-reimbursable basis; all other support or services must be reimbursable using the appropriate fund source.
 - Direct IS funds should not be used to provide overhead for specific M&R or New Work projects, nor used to provide funding for design, maintenance, repair or new work projects.
 - Any service or study for OMA-funded initiatives, such as project development, scoping, DD1391 preparation, IDIQ-contract development, is an appropriate use for OMA IS funds.
 - OMA funds may be used in support of 'Army Working Capital Fund' (AWCF) installations and installations with similar non-appropriated funds, but, the purpose of AWCF or similar funds is to be self-supporting, and MSCs should seek reimbursement for services provided.
8. The MSCs provide regional support to installations. Using checkbook funds, MSCs can purchase individual, direct support services for installations from districts, labs, CXs or other sources.

SECTION 3

MANPOWER

The initial FY 03 workyear allocations are based on a review and analysis of several factors that include workload, funding levels, utilization trends, budget proposals, and FTE ceiling limitations and targets. Based on our best projections, we feel that each command is receiving the manpower resources necessary to accomplish their respective missions. Each command has reviewed their FTE allocation and provided Headquarters consolidated comments. Reference the CERM Manpower Home Page, Calendar of Events.

The allocation includes changes to division offices staffing based on the Commanding General's decision at ENFORCE to provide each MSC one additional manpower space. This additional authorization, which will be funded with General Expense, will serve to enhance the legal staff at each MSC. Local Commanders have flexibility in the internal distribution of the FTE allocations and execution within their respective commands to ensure the most efficient and economic utilization of manpower resources. Therefore, if during the year a command determines that their allocation is insufficient to execute actual workload, they should first adjust within the command, and then, if necessary come forward to HQUSACE with a request for additional resources.

Final allocations for Fiscal Year 2003 were sent out last September for your information and use in developing your respective utilization plans for the year. Utilization Plans involve two distinct projections that in turn estimate execution of military funded as well as civil funded manpower resources. Once again, keep in mind that the basis for the plan projections are the final allocations which were sent out in September and presented in this section of the guidance. The Civilian Employment Plan (CEP) which uses a separate format to report projected execution by activity and appropriation (OMA, RDTE and MCA) details usage of your military funded manpower resources. Likewise, the Civil Works Utilization Plan (CWUP) uses a different format to report planned execution by Core activity (CORE) and Support for Others (SFO). As in the previous years, we will allow for midyear adjustments to the plan. The adjustments need to be supported by reasonable justification which needs to be approved by HQUSACE. Further guidance on this will be sent in the April 2003 timeframe.

Headquarters is not retaining a reserve of FTE. We will therefore readjust from among the commands based on past as well as projected utilization patterns. Each command is authorized to exceed their final allocation by up to two percent in the year of execution and is expected to manage their hire lag aggressively to obtain the optimum use of manpower resources.

We will continue to focus attention this fiscal year to maintaining our activities relative to several manpower programs receiving increased emphasis from DA and OMB. This includes initiatives mandated by the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act, the President's management agenda – competitive sourcing initiatives, and various actions supporting the Army Stationing Installation Plan (ASIP), the Total Army Analysis (TAA) and the Army Transformation.

MILITARY FUNDED MANPOWER

1. The February POM submission is the primary basis for the FY 03 allocation. The POM, program manager input, and CERRMMS modeling impacted the FY 04 – 06 allocations.
2. The controlling factor in measuring manpower utilization will continue to be FTE. However, end strength numbers remain important, as they will continue to be monitored and reported to higher headquarters.
3. Accurate planning for the execution of manpower is critical to insure maximum utilization of available resources. Timely and accurate submission of the Civilian Employment Plans (CEP) is essential.
4. Commands must ensure that all military funded work is accurately charged in CEFMS. This will allow for accurate capture of utilization in the Manpower Utilization Module. It is critical that all required reports be submitted in an accurate and timely manner.
5. Additional information on new guidance and future initiatives will be provided as needed.

CIVIL WORKS FUNDED MANPOWER

1. The initial FY 03 FTE allocation is based on workload representing historic funding levels with an allowance for three-percent inflation in the outyears. Therefore, no FTE was withheld for congressional actions.
2. Adjustments to the initial allocation will be based on field comments and guidance from the Director of Civil Works, HQUSACE.
3. Complete and timely submission of Civil Works Usage Plans (CWUP) is important. Emphasis should also be placed on timely and accurate submission of 113G reports.
4. A Civil Funded FTE report and a Civil Funded Customer report have been added to the list of required upward monthly reports to CEEMIS.

SECTION 3

MANPOWER

UNIFORMED MANPOWER ALLOCATIONS AND GRADE CEILINGS FY 03 (0203)

	MILITARY FUNDED									CIVIL WORKS FUNDED								
ORG	OFF						WO	EN	TOTAL	OFF						WO	ENL	TOTAL
	GO	06	05	04	03	02				GO	06	05	04	03	02			
HNC	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
LRD	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	11	9	24	0	0		49
MVD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	10	17	0	0		42
NAD	1	1	5	4	4	0	0	0	15	0	5	4	5	18	0	0		32
NWD	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	7	1	4	3	5	14	0	0		27
POD	0	3	5	3	9	0	0	6	26	1	1	1	3	7	0	0		13
SAD	0	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	9	1	4	5	5	5	0	0		20
SPD	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	4	5	13	0	0		25
SWD	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	5	1	4	4	1	21	0	0		31
TAC	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
D/C Total	2	13	24	19	19	0	0	6	83	7	31	39	43	119	0	0		239
ERDC	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	0	1	2	4	10	0	0		17
Lab Total	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	0	1	2	4	10	0	0		17
HECSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
FOA Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
249th PPB	0	0	1	2	4	0	9	174	190	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
PP School	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
Total 249th	0	0	1	2	4	0	10	183	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
TRG	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
AMHA	1	5	4	1	0	0	0	4	15	2	7	14	11	9	0	1		44
HQ Total	1	7	5	1	0	0	0	4	18	2	7	14	11	9	0	1	0	44
Cmd Total	3	21	30	23	23	0	11	199	310	9	39	55	58	138	0	1	0	300

AMHA has 3 AGR (non-add) 1-O6, 1-O5, 1-O4

HNC has 1 AGR (non-add) O5

SECTION 3

MANPOWER

UNIFORMED MANPOWER ALLOCATIONS AND GRADE CEILINGS FY 04 (0104)

ORG	MILITARY FUNDED									CIVIL WORKS FUNDED								
	OFF						WO	EN	TOTAL	OFF						WO	ENL	TOTAL
	GO	06	05	04	03	02				GO	06	05	04	03	02			
HNC	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
LRD	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	11	9	24	0	0		49
MVD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	10	17	0	0		42
NAD	1	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	10	0	5	4	5	18	0	0		32
NWD	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	3	5	14	0	0		27
POD	0	3	4	1	3	0	0	6	17	1	1	1	3	7	0	0		13
SAD	0	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	9	1	4	5	5	5	0	0		20
SPD	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	4	5	13	0	0		25
SWD	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4	1	21	0	0		31
TAC	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
D/C Total	2	13	20	9	9	0	0	6	59	7	31	39	43	119	0	0		239
ERDC	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	0	1	2	4	10	0	0		17
Lab Total	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	0	1	2	4	10	0	0		17
HECSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
FOA Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
249th PPB	0	0	1	2	4	0	9	174	190	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
PP School	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
Total 249th	0	0	1	2	4	0	10	183	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
TRG	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
AMHA	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	8	2	7	14	11	9	0	1		44
HQ Total	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	4	11	2	7	14	11	9	0	1	0	44
Cmd Total	3	17	23	13	13	0	11	199	279	9	39	55	58	138	0	1	0	300

AMHA has 3 AGR (non-add) 1-O6, 1-O5, 1-O4

HNC has 1 AGR (non-add) O5

Note: Total Army Analysis (TAA) 09 decisions reduced uniformed military by 31 Officers in FY 04-out.

SECTION 3

MANPOWER

UNIFORMED MANPOWER ALLOCATIONS AND GRADE CEILING FY 05-09 (0105)

ORG	MILITARY FUNDED									CIVIL WORKS FUNDED								
	OFF						WO	EN	TOTAL	OFF						WO	ENL	TOTAL
	GO	06	05	04	03	02				GO	06	05	04	03	02			
HNC	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LRD	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	11	9	24	0	0	0	49
MVD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	10	17	0	0	0	42
NAD	1	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	10	0	5	4	5	18	0	0	0	32
NWD	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	3	5	14	0	0	0	27
POD	0	3	4	1	3	0	0	6	17	1	1	1	3	7	0	0	0	13
SAD	0	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	9	1	4	5	5	5	0	0	0	20
SPD	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	4	5	13	0	0	0	25
SWD	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4	1	21	0	0	0	31
TAC	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D/C Total	2	13	20	9	9	0	0	6	59	7	31	39	43	119	0	0	0	239
ERDC	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	0	1	2	4	10	0	0	0	17
Lab Total	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	0	1	2	4	10	0	0	0	17
HECSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FOA Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249th PPB	0	0	1	2	4	0	9	174	190	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PP School	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total 249th	0	0	1	2	4	0	10	183	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRG	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AMHA	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	7	2	7	14	11	9	0	1	0	44
HQ Total	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	3	10	2	7	14	11	9	0	1	0	44
Cmd Total	3	17	23	13	13	0	11	198	278	9	39	55	58	138	0	1	0	300

AMHA has 3 AGR (non-add) 1-O6, 1-O5, 1-O4

HNC has 1 AGR (non-add) O5

Note: Total Army Analysis (TAA) 09 decisions reduced uniformed military by 31 Officers in FY 04-out.

SECTION 3**MANPOWER****FY 03 FINAL ALLOCATION**

Organization	Civil Works	Military	Total
LRD	4,317	442	4,759
MVD	5,392	142	5,534
NAD	2,337	1,456	3,793
NWD	3,966	1,018	4,984
POD	304	1,557	1,861
SAD	3,006	1,000	4,006
SPD	1,800	603	2,403
SWD	2,406	672	3,078
MSC Subtotal	23,528	6,890	30,418
HNC	70	635	705
TAC	1	315	316
ERDC	687	1,293	1,980
MDC	30	0	30
UFC	204	107	311
Center Subtotal	992	2,350	3,342
IWR	159	0	159
HECSA	92	81	173
Prime Power School	0	25	25
249th AUG TDA	0	7	7
Other Subtotal	251	113	364
HQ	444	263	707
TRG	0	130	130
HQ Subtotal	444	393	837
USACE TOTAL	25,215	9,746	34,961

PMBP DEPLOYMENT SCHEDULE FOR P2

P2 is an automated information system (AIS) to effectively manage all programs and projects in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Its functions include the capability to scope, develop and track critical path networks, assign resource estimates, compare estimated costs to actual costs, perform earned value analysis, and maintain a historical record of a project. For an overview briefing on P2, go to <http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/pmbp/P2/p2brief/index.htm>.

P2, as a project and programs management tool, provides structure and support to the Corps corporate, regional, and district-level and project management business processes. Additionally, P2 provides for a corporate database utilized for decision support capability, utilizing on-line analytical processing (OLAP) tools to display Corps management information in various views and to generate customized reports.

P2 is a commercial off the shelf (COTS) solution. The application is a 3-tier architecture accessible through a web browser on the client. It is the sole Project Management Automated Information System (PM-AIS) for the Corps. To view a flow chart describing the processes in Oracle Projects and Primavera Project Planner Expedition (P3e), go to the following site: http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/pmbp/P2/P2_Process_Flow.gif.

P2 is a major technological enhancement of the legacy system, PROMIS, already fielded. PROMIS was a significant leap forward in project management capability for the Corps. It integrated the business functions of multiple, redundant AIS into a single technology solution. It has proven effective in meeting its limited objectives. However, subsequent to the fielding of PROMIS, advances in technology have rendered the system incapable of fulfilling today's requirement of programs and project management, resource management, virtual project team and regional business center concept.

For planning purposes, the following deployment guidance is provided:

- Preliminary Meetings/Pre deployment discussions - 80 manhours
- Data Conversion of historical PROMIS data - 80 manhours
- System Installation - 160 manhours
- General Support - 280 manhours
- Estimated Total Manhours to support the P2 Deployment: 600 manhours

Assumptions:

- Typical district being deployed in March/April or later in FY 03
- Hours based on a deployment team of four individuals at the district
- User of PROMIS and data conversion required
- General support for power users to answer questions for remainder of FY 03 (Mar-Sep)

For a district who has not used PROMIS and therefore does not have any or very limited historical PROMIS data in which they would like converted over P2, the required data conversion manhours are straight forward.

SECTION 3

PMBP

PMBP CURRICULUM TIME TRAINING ESTIMATE

For an overview on the PMBP curriculum, click on the following site:

<http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/pmbp/curriculum.html>.

Minimum Requirements for self-study and small group discussion:

Course	%Trained	Completion Date Goal	Hours required (CD and SGD)
Intro/Course 1,2, 3 Why PMBP? Teams and Me Public Service and Me	100	FY 02 By FY 03 1Q By FY 03 1Q	15*
Course 4, 5 Organization, Teams & Me Quality & the PDT	60	FY 03	10
Course 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working in the PDT (Module 1) Working in the PDT (all modules) BP/P2 detail <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Managers PMBP PDT workforce P3e/Oracle suite (differing levels based on need) 	90% 60 (% reduces with increasing level of detail depending on need)	FY 03 Overview (all audiences) Block 1 Block 2 (You only take the appropriate level) Block 3 (Times for block 1-3 are additive-maximum estimated 56 hrs)	1-2 8 2 4-6 16-24 12-24
Course 7	60	FY 03	5
Course 8	100	FY 03	1

*Estimated 2-3 hours self-study; 2 hours SGD per Courses 1-5 and 7. Course 6 has varying requirements depending on person's role in the organization and level of familiarity in using work management software tools.

Course 8 will be a series of testimonial videos regarding PMBP and a summary of curriculum key points.

Districts will have to fund the cost of training from their operating budget. The intent is to continue normal training and do PMBP training in addition. The training cost will increase overhead rates (especially departmental OH). HQ will no longer rate MSC on total labor multipliers (TLM). The MSC S&A checkbooks have been reimbursed from the HQ S&A reserve for the estimated cost of training the staff funded from the military S&A flat rates (see S&A in this section).

SECTION 3

EXECUTIVE DIRECTION & MGT FUNDING

FY2003-2005 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE (CCG)
\$000

COMMAND	GENERAL EXPENSES (GE) 96X3124								OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE, ARMY (OMA) 21 Y 2020							
	FY 02 (ACT)		FY 03 (BGT) -Adj Tax [see:3]		FY 04 (PROG)		FY 05 (PROG)		FY 02 (ACT)		FY 03 (BGT)		FY 04 (PROG)		FY 05 (PROG)	
	FTE	FUNDS	FTE	FUNDS	FTE	FUNDS	FTE	FUNDS	FTE	FUNDS	FTE	FUNDS	FTE	FUNDS	FTE	FUNDS
LRD	81	11101.0	81	10676.9	82	10464.1	82	11087.7	13	1515.8	13	1504.6	13	1701.1	13	1786.8
MVD	83	10238.9	84	10047.8	84	9847.8	84	10434.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
NAD	71	9846.1	72	9637.6	72	9446.0	72	10009.1	26	2856.6	26	2813.9	26	3181.4	26	3341.8
NWD	73	10017.0	74	9504.6	74	9315.6	74	9870.9	21	2494.3	21	2411.5	21	2726.5	21	2864.0
POD	20	3257.5	20	3188.6	20	3126.0	20	3312.4	54	7024.3	54	7066.9	54	7990.0	54	8392.8
SAD	75	10476.6	76	10348.5	76	10142.6	76	10747.1	20	2464.9	20	2414.3	20	2729.7	20	2867.4
SPD	73	10360.7	74	10072.0	74	9871.5	74	10459.9	18	2053.0	18	1999.4	18	2260.6	18	2374.6
SWD	70	8504.1	71	8454.8	71	8287.2	71	8781.1	21	2009.3	21	1931.4	21	2183.6	21	2293.7
TOTAL MSC	546	73802.0	552	71930.9	553	70500.9	553	74703.0	173	20418.2	173	20142.0	173	22773.0	173	23921.0
HQ: OPERATING BGT	419	53006.9	420	50897.3	420	50013.4	420	52994.4	271	29605.9	271	29939.3	271	35678.0	271	38320.0
PROG ACCOUNTS	0	6885.3	0	7558.4	0	8000.0	0	8000.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL HQ	419	59892.2	420	58455.7	420	58013.4	420	60994.4	271	29605.9	271	29939.3	271	35678.0	271	38320.0
HECSA: HEC PORTION	85	8125.0	85	8373.7	85	8213.5	85	8703.0	41	4958.9	41	4852.4	41	7239.4	41	7601.3
HQ PORTION	0	9466.0	0	8801.2	0	8626.4	0	9140.6	0	1317.6	0	1289.3	0	1923.6	0	2019.7
SUBTOT HECSA	85	17591.0	85	17174.9	85	16839.9	85	17843.6	41	6276.5	41	6141.7	41	9163.0	41	9621.0
ERDC	2	283.0	2	274.4	2	269.1	2	285.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
IWR	25	3466.0	25	4661.3	25	3308.7	25	3505.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
UFC	10	1040.0	10	1007.7	10	988.0	10	1046.9	10	867.0	10	843.0	10	956.0	10	980.0
TOTAL OTHER FOA	122	22380.0	122	23118.3	122	21405.7	122	22681.6	51	7143.5	51	6984.7	51	10119.0	51	10601.0
GRAND TOTAL	1087	156074.2	1094	153504.9	1095	149920.1	1095	158378.9	495	57167.6	495	57066.0	495	68570.0	495	72842.0

Footnotes:
1. The "official" USACE CCG is published by CERMP, 3 times a year. This is solely an update of the ED&M portion as approved by the SPBAC of 25 Sep 02 w/required adjustments as footnoted below.
2. The ED&M Centralized PCS Account was **disestablished** effective FY03, w/approved programed amounts (i.e., GE \$3M & OMA \$1.4M) **distributed** to the commands, prorated IAW PCS rmts.
3. FY03 GE command's funding **includes** distribution of \$3M (HQ ULO Review find), i.e., \$1.5M to HQ/HEC & \$1.5M to MSCs/ERDC/IWR/UFC; to alleviate prior 4% tax reduction (\$6027.4K).
4. FY03 GE **excludes** Command Council decision to transfer 8 FTEs (= \$895K) from HQ & HECSA to the MSCs. It **includes** 6 FTE for civilianization of the PMO (1 for MVD, NAD, NWD, SAD, SPD & SWD). LRD's in FY04.
5. FY03 GE "GRAND TOTAL" line **includes** the \$1M proposed House cut (proportionally distributed to all cmdts).
6. FY03 OMA Budget (funding) **reflects** distribution of Congressional/Funding letter cuts to the ED&M program of \$3050K.

CERM-B/20 Dec 2002 (Rev #7)

SECTION 3 SUPERVISION & ADMINISTRATION (S&A)

The Board of Directors (BOD) approved the Supervision and Administration (S&A) Regionalization proposal on 16 August 1999 to improve the method of S&A management and to promote the regional business center concept. Implementation took place on 1 October 1999 and an S&A “checking account” was established for each MSC. MSCs took ownership of these funds and are responsible for managing on a break-even basis over the long term. S&A Regionalization works by crediting future gains and losses to each MSC S&A checking account.

S&A operates out of the Civil Works Revolving Fund and must meet the nominal balance requirement like other accounts in the Revolving Fund. Gains or losses in the MSC checkbooks can caused the Corps-wide S&A accounts (HQ MILCON and O&M reserves + MSC checking accounts) to be outside the nominal balance requirement (4 months S&A expense \pm 1 months expense). **Therefore MSC will have a nominal balance limits for their checkbook account. For FY 03 and beyond the upper limit is 2.5 (3 for FY 02) months expense (average projected for the year) and the lower limit is .5 months expenses. MSC Balances in excess of this amount will become a part of the HQ reserve. Plans that cause the balance to fall below the minimum will be adjusted or requires justification for HQ approval.** MSC are still expected to recoup their losses.

S&A Regionalization provides an incentive for MSCs to wisely manage their regional S&A accounts. If their expenses stay below their income, they grow a balance for use during low-income phases of the construction. If their expenses exceed income, they must take action to reduce costs to stay within their finite account. The regional S&A management approach has a more “forward” focus; it promotes wise investments in the workforce, which produce long-term benefits, and gives MSCs greater flexibility in responding to customer needs.

The tables on the following page reflect MSC “target” S&A rates for the next three fiscal years. They were developed based on placement and expense projections submitted to HQUSACE. **An adjustment will be made to the MSC checkbook account to cover the training expense to implement PMBP and P2. The adjustment is calculated at the average Corp-wide cost (4% of FY 03 expenses). By funding this cost from the central HQ reserve normal training should not be impacted Adjustments were also made to reimburse MSCs for their cost to participate in the SAPS study. Customers should be provided the same level of staffing and S&A services as before.** “Target” S&A rates are shown in the table below. Acceptable variation from the “target S&A rates are \pm . 3% for MILCON, \pm . 4% for O&M, and \pm . 6% for DERP.

SECTION 3 SUPERVISION & ADMINISTRATION (S&A)

Target S&A Rates				Checkbook Adj. (\$000)	
<u>FY 03</u>	<u>MILCON</u>	<u>O&M</u>	<u>DERP</u>	<u>PMBP</u>	<u>SAPS</u>
LRD	6.2%	6.3%	7.6%	483	44
NAD	6.1%	7.5%	8.1%	1,958	35
NWD	5.8%	7.0%	8.5%	1,092	115
POD	6.4%	8.2%	9.1%	1,961	200
SAD	5.8%	6.8%	8.3%	1,545	
SPD	5.7%	6.5%	7.3%	843	
SWD	5.7%	6.5%	8.1%	920	
TAC	7.0%	8.0%	N/A	93	
<u>FY 04</u>	<u>MILCON</u>	<u>O&M</u>	<u>DERP</u>		
LRD	6.1%	6.8%	7.6%		
NAD	6.1%	7.5%	8.1%		
NWD	5.9%	7.0%	8.5%		
POD	6.4%	8.1%	8.5%		
SAD	5.8%	6.8%	8.2%		
SPD	5.8%	6.6%	7.2%		
SWD	5.7%	6.5%	8.1%		
TAC	8.0%	N/A	N/A		
<u>FY 05</u>	<u>MILCON</u>	<u>O&M</u>	<u>DERP</u>		
LRD	6.0%	6.4%	8.1%		
NAD	6.1%	7.5%	8.1%		
NWD	6.0%	7.0%	8.5%		
POD	6.5%	8.0%	8.5%		
SAD	5.8%	6.8%	8.1%		
SPD	5.8%	6.7%	7.8%		
SWD	5.7%	6.5%	8.0%		
TAC	8.0%	N/A	N/A		

SECTION 3

COST OF DOING BUSINESS

Command Management Reviews will include Cost of Doing Business (CODB) performance targets, General and Administrative (G&A) overhead, Chargeability and Total Labor Multiplier (TLM). The objectives of establishing (CODB) performance targets are to provide a basis for benchmarking and decision making, to encourage better management of resources and to improve financial analysis. The guidance is being provided to advise the Regional Management Boards (RMB) and to enable development of a multi-year Command Operating Budget. Each Field Operating Activity should develop its budget to attain these performance targets, which are based upon historical achievements, the AE industry index, agency financial guides and strategic corporate objectives.

The various rates have been adjusted generally upward to account for workforce transformation to more FERS employees, expansion of outsourcing and continuation of the Consolidated Departmental Overhead (CDO) concept. Consideration of higher operating costs has been given also, to OCONUS areas of operations or smaller districts. A district's workload and the size of its direct labor base have been recognized as justification for incorporating economies of scale where appropriate to G&A and TLM rates.

The CODB performance targets for Districts **participating in CDO** are as follows:

	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>	<u>FY 05</u>
<u>G&A</u>			
CONUS Civil (S)	.32	.32	.32
(M)	.27	.27	.27
(L)	.23	.23	.23
OCONUS Civil	.33	.33	.33
CONUS Military (S)	.26	.25	.25
(L)	.24	.23	.23
OCONUS Military (S)	.30	.31	.31
(L)	.28	.31	.31
<u>TLM</u>			
Civil (S)	2.55	2.57	2.57
(M)	2.52	2.55	2.55
(L)	2.51	2.53	2.53
Military	2.45	2.46	2.46
<u>Chargeability</u>			
Military and Civil	.60	.60	.60

NOTE: (S) = Smaller Districts (M) = Middle Districts (L) = Larger District

SECTION 3**COST OF DOING BUSINESS**

The CODB performance targets for Districts **not participating in CDO** are as follows:

	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>	<u>FY 05</u>
<u>G&A</u>			
CONUS Civil (S)	.33	.33	.33
(M)	.28	.28	.28
(L)	.24	.24	.24
OCONUS Civil	.33	.33	.33
CONUS Military (S)	.27	.26	.26
(L)	.25	.24	.24
OCONUS Military (S)	.31	.31	.31
(L)	.29	.31	.31
<u>TLM</u>			
Civil Design (S)	2.58	2.65	2.65
(M)	2.56	2.61	2.61
(L)	2.54	2.57	2.57
Civil Planning	2.58	2.61	2.61
Civil Construction	2.51	2.53	2.53
Civil O&M (S)	2.50	2.51	2.51
(M)	2.37	2.38	2.38
(L)	2.27	2.34	2.34
Military Design (Non-DERP)	2.49	2.49	2.49
Military Design DERP	2.50	2.50	2.50
Military Construction	2.43	2.46	2.46
Military Real Estate	2.41	2.44	2.44
<u>Chargeability</u>			
Military and Civil	.60	.60	.60

NOTE: (S) = Smaller Districts (M) = Middle Districts (L) = Larger District

SECTION 3

COST OF DOING BUSINESS

G&A Overhead (example = FY 04 targets)

\$	CATEGORY	TARGET	<GREEN	>AMBER<	RED>
Military	CONUS CDOs	25%	28%	28%	30%
Military	CONUS CDOI	23%	25%	25%	28%
Military	OCONUS CDOs	31%	34%	34%	37%
Military	OCONUS CDOI	31%	34%	34%	37%
Military	CONUSs	26%	29%	29%	31%
Military	CONUSI	24%	26%	26%	29%
Military	OCONUS	31%	34%	34%	37%
Civil	CONUS CDOs	32%	35%	35%	38%
Civil	CONUS CDOm	27%	30%	30%	32%
Civil	CONUS CDOI	23%	25%	25%	28%
Civil	OCONUS CDO	33%	36%	36%	40%
Civil	CONUSs	33%	36%	36%	40%
Civil	CONUSm	28%	31%	31%	34%
Civil	CONUSI	24%	26%	26%	29%
Civil	OCONUS NON-CDO	33%	36%	36%	40%
Green: Less than 10% above Target					
Amber: Greater than 10% but, less than 20% above target					
Red: Greater than 20% above target					

TLM (example = FY 04 targets)

\$	CATEGORY	≤GREEN	>AMBER<	RED≥
Military	CDO	2.46	2.47	2.58
Military	Real Estate	2.44	2.45	2.56
Military	Design	2.49	2.50	2.61
Military	Design, Derp/Brac	2.50	2.51	2.63
Military	Construction	2.46	2.47	2.58
Civil	CDOs	2.57	2.58	2.70
Civil	CDOm	2.55	2.56	2.68
Civil	CDOI	2.53	2.54	2.66
Civil	DESIGNs	2.65	2.66	2.78
Civil	DESIGNm	2.61	2.62	2.74
Civil	DESIGNI	2.57	2.58	2.70
Civil	Planning	2.61	2.62	2.74
Civil	Construction	2.53	2.54	2.66
Civil	O&Ms	2.51	2.52	2.64
Civil	O&Mm	2.38	2.39	2.50
Civil	O&MI	2.34	2.35	2.46
		Better<<<< <<<<<<<>>>>>> Worse		
		Green: Less than or equal to Target		
		Amber: Greater but, less than 5% above target		
		Red: Equal or greater than 5% above target		

Chargeability

Green: ≤ 3% below target OR < 7% above target i. e. 58% to 64%.	
Amber:	>3% below target and <7% below target OR ≥ 7% above target and <12% above target i.e. 57% or (65% to 66%)
Red:	≥ 5% below target OR ≥ 12% above target i. e. (56% and below) or (67% and above)

SECTION 3

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) CHARGES

1. Management costs, including development, testing and operations of HQUSACE-directed IT are paid by either direct funding (including PRIP) or by a fee-for-service. Starting this Fiscal Year, all IT fee-for-service charges will be a Site License (a one-time annual fee). This will include the CEEIS infrastructure costs, CEFMS, CEEMIS and REMIS, which were all previously charged based on metered usage on the CEEIS platform. Fee-for-service pays for operations, maintenance and PRIP payback.

2. The following are the site license fees for FY 03 and estimated for 04 and 05. These fees are based on the amounts submitted in the Information Technology Investment Portfolio System (ITIPS). These fees are dependent upon the results of final Headquarters approval of funding levels and any significant change in the number of sites. A more detailed breakout is at the following link: <ftp://ftp.hq.usace.army.mil/CERM/FY03SiteLicense.xls> which reflects charges to each activity/office down to the district level. An attempt was made to include all known IT/AIS charges to the field, regardless of billing methodology or source.

AIS	Est # Licenses FY 03	Fee per Lic FY 03	Fee per Lic FY 04	Fee per Lic FY 05
PCASE	20	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
VIMS	48	4,448	0	0
APPMS	58	8,207	8,258	8,258
CACES	266	4,662	4,662	4,662
RECIS	1,333	254	266	273
REMIS	1,244	1,093	1,126	1,160
RMS	281	6,050	6,050	6,050
E-MCX	40,813	43	45	45
PPDS	56	7,412	0	0
ACASS/CCASS	13,606	82	58	59
PROMIS	45	81,288	0	0
CWMS	215	9,341	9,944	10,087
DrChecks	43	10,347	10,878	10,878
SPECS INTACT	42	5,976	5,976	5,976
FEMS	27	94,616	57,794	57,794
NRRS	25	10,611	8,000	8,000
CEFMS/CEEMIS	37,890	442	455	483
CEALS	5,000	Varies	Varies	Varies

* CEFMS/CEEMIS estimated cost per user. See actual criteria below.

Infrastructure	Est # Licenses FY 03	Fee per Lic FY 03	Fee per Lic FY 04	Fee per Lic FY 05
CEEIS	37,890	702	736	736
SIPRNET	58	34,160	34,160	34,160
DCS	N/A			

* SIPRNET and DCS explanation is included in the Concept of Operations (pg. 2-47)

SECTION 3

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

IT CHARGES (CONT'D)

1/ The criteria for determining the site license fees are as follows:

PCASE - Based on the total cost divided evenly between those districts utilizing the programs.

VIMS – Total cost equally divided among organizations which have vehicles. System will be subsumed by FEMS in FY 04.

APPMS – Total cost equally divided among 58 organizations required to have a property book.

CACES – Total cost is allocated based on the number of authorized Cost Engineer manpower spaces at each district/FOA.

RECIS – Based on the number of authorized RE positions at the district/FOA, HQ's and MSC's divided by the total number of authorized RE positions which gives us a percent times the total cost.

REMIS – Based on the number of authorized RE positions at the district/FOA divided by the total number of authorized RE positions which gives us a percent times the total cost.

RMS – Total cost is allocated proportionately based on the number of Area / Resident offices plus one for the District. The cost increase for RMS this year is primary to cover the PRIP payback cost (which just started) and the expected increased cost of security (DITSCAP). Outside of these two increases, all other costs (i.e., Staff, software, hardware, contract support, travel, training, supplies and facility costs) are expected to remain the same.

E-MCX – Total cost is allocated based on number of e-mail mailboxes that each site places in the Corps-wide X.500 Directory.

PPDS – Based on the total number of MSCs, Districts, Centers and Labs (56), with ERDC counted as 4 labs. The total cost is divided by the number of sites for a cost per site. System will be subsumed by P2 in FY 04.

ACASS/CCASS – Total cost is allocated based on the number of evaluations per site.

PROMIS – PROMIS Fee for Service billings in FY 02 and 03 are based on District workload, as reflected in the Integrated Command Resource Information (ICRI) Tables managed by CERM-P. The methodology is a departure from FY 01 and prior years where numbers of projects in PROMIS was used to distribute costs. The new methodology fairly distributes the fee for service

SECTION 3

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

IT CHARGES (CONT'D)

for all FOAs based on their workload. The amount shown (\$81,288/site) is a gross average per site. The number of sites is the total number of Districts/Centers/Labs (45 counting all of ERDC as one lab) that plan and execute projects. Actual FY 03 charges will range between \$20K and \$200K based on a FOA's FY 03 forecasted Military, Environmental and Civil Works workload as reflected in the current CERM-P's ICRI Tables, which is based on FOA input. The numbers are preliminary, as the Military workload estimates for FY 03 have not been updated at this time. The almost 3 fold increase from FY 01 billing is due to accelerated PRIP payback which must be liquidated prior to full deployment of P2 which will replace PROMIS in FY 04. The percentage distribution in the PROMIS bill is approximately 58% PRIP and 42% Operations and Maintenance. The Operations and Maintenance portion of PROMIS Fee for Service charges will be rebated to FOAs on a case by case basis as P2 is deployed. MSCs have the authority to combine and re-allocate District Fee for Service billings commensurate with workload changes as long as the total billing remains the same.

CWMS –The cost allocation is in proportion to pre-determined subscription units allocated to offices based on an analysis of the water control management system and responsibilities in each Corps office. CWMS fees are assessed based on the number of subscriptions allocated to each individual District. Increases in fees starting FY 03 are due to initiation of PRIP payback for CWMS development. Funding for support/enterprise management is also added to this fee after CWMS is deployed to your District.

DrChecks – Two basic license fees are applied: large users (\$9,250) and small users (\$6,525) determined by the amount of PED funds received by districts and centers per the FY 01 Cost of Doing Business Report. There are two exceptions due to small PED allocations at LRE and SAC. For these two sites, a rate of \$3,435 is applied. The dividing line between large and small users is set at a PED allocation of \$11,250,000; the dividing line for "exceptions" is \$3,000,000. The amounts shown are the average per site for each FY.

SPECSINTACT – License fees determined by prorating the total system cost against the amount of MP and CW PED funds received by districts and centers as identified on RM's Cost of Doing Business Report for FY 01 (the latest data that reflects an entire FY and apples-to-apples MP/CW costs). By regulation, SPECSINTACT is not required for OCONUS work, so NAU is not included; however, POD polled their districts and found that they use the system and want to support it. Accordingly, POF, POH, and POJ are included in the charges.

FEMS – Division, Centers, Field Operating Activities will be billed for data conversion and training costs during FY 03 and FY 04. In FY 03 27 sites will be implemented and 17 sites in FY 04. The amount shown is the average amount to be collected. Site license fees to maintain the system and payback the PRIP will commence upon full implementation of the system. USACE-wide implementation will begin in FY 03 and end in FY 04. Site license fee will begin in FY 05.

SECTION 3

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

IT CHARGES (CONT'D)

NRRS – The amount shown (\$10,611) is an average cost per district. Districts are charged a variable rate based on the number of park office sites per district and the telecommunications options used by each site.

CEFMS/CEEMIS – The amounts for each site is based upon transactions processed in CEFMS. Transactions for the twelve month period ended April 2002 were compiled and percentages were calculated based on the number of each site's transactions as a proportion of total transactions. The respective percentages were then applied to the combined total amounts requested in ITIPS for CEFMS and CEEMIS.

CEALS – Subscribers are segregated into Counsel Members and Non-Counsel Members. Counsel team groups/members are assessed a higher administrative fee to cover CEALS AIS costs. Non-Counsel Team Groups are assessed a lower administrative fee to cover costs associated with obtaining and maintaining the services. The administrative fee is calculated/computed using their monthly billing totals and the fee is added to the bottom total.

3. All AIS FY 03 budget figures have yet to be reviewed by the Cross Functional Assessment Team (CFAT) and presented to the Junior Program Budget Advisory Committee (JPBAC) and the Senior Program Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC). The budget figures shown represent the best information available at this time and may change prior to FY 03.

4. POCs are Ed Zammit, CERM-BA, (202) 761-0075, Brenda Gooden, CECI-C, (202) 761-7115 or the AIS POC identified in ITIPS database.

SECTION 3

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

CORPS OF ENGINEERS ENTERPRISE INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES (CEEIS) CHARGES

1. The CEAP-IA program came to the end of the CDC/Syntegra contract effective 30 September 2000. The follow on CEEIS Program was established to reflect this new phase in the life cycle of the Corps' corporate IT infrastructure. In FY 01 the Processing Centers, located at Vicksburg, MS and Portland, OR, began operating under new vendor contracts to procure required hardware, software, maintenance, and services to support the processing centers and the network infrastructure. The program management responsibility for the CEEIS program is located at ERDC/Vicksburg/ITL, where the network infrastructure, network security, and systems operations are centrally managed.
2. Among major influences on the CEEIS program during FY 02 were the Army's AKM initiative and the assigned CEEIS role as a Region within the AKM-NETCOM framework; exploding Wide-Area-Network (WAN) growth; establishing consistent corporate connectivity to the regional CPOC offices; developing Continuity of Operations (COOP) capabilities; meeting DITSCAP accreditation criteria; an information assurance program that maintains continual vigilance over the IT infrastructure; and the development of consistent processes to assure year-end processing performs in a reliable, trouble-free manner.
3. CEEIS expects FY 03 to bring opportunities and challenges in a number of areas, among these are launching a formal Configuration Management program; continuing cooperation and participation with Army in the establishment of NETCOM; compliance with Army's Networkiness program; the ability to use Virtual Private Network (VPN) capability to remotely access corporate resources will become widely available and will impact the increased need to provide telework opportunities to the USACE workforce; the CEEIS network will be improving its ability to perform "lights-out" monitoring and troubleshooting.
4. In early FY 01, CECI chartered a Process Action Team (PAT) by request of the Division Information Managers (DIM) to formulate a fair and equitable methodology for billing CEEIS costs (corporate network and infrastructure only--NOT the AIS's costs). The PAT recommendation was to bill CEEIS costs based on a flat fee by user ID. CECI and CERM have reached joint approval on the recommendation and distribution of CEEIS costs will be based on a flat fee per user basis beginning in FY 03. Users will be counted via the U-PASS system and registration in U-PASS for users of CEEIS resources has been mandated by CECI. It is anticipated that a snapshot count of user-ids will take place quarterly to allow for differences in seasonal hires and major reductions/increases in users during the year. More specific guidance will be provided.
5. Budgeted costs for FY 02 were \$26,128,729. The estimated budget for FY 03 is \$26,585,000, which represents an overall 1.7% increase. As of 7 June 2002, there were 37,890 users registered in U-PASS. This results in a cost of \$702 per user per year.
6. POC is the CEEIS Program Manager, Dr. Peggy Wright, CEERD-IV-Z, at 601-634-4630.

SECTION 3**PRIP****PLANT REPLACEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (PRIP)**

(\$000)

	FY 02 Actual	FY 03	FY 04
CEHNC	2,799	7,269	823
CELRD	4,693	4,393	2,225
CEMVD	4,648	2,721	4,233
CENAD	3,079	4,670	2,205
CENWD	2,016	4,613	9,644
CEPOD	360	49	0
CESAD	3,583	510	587
CESPD	1,157	1,167	855
CESWD	1,130	1,300	1,982
CEHQ	955	7,378	4,200
CEHEC	2,053	2,212	2,771
CEMDC	32,355	47,059	46,838
CEFC	0	0	26
CEERD (WES)	14,458	7,274	8,327
<i>Total</i>	<i>73,286</i>	<i>90,615</i>	<i>84,716</i>

Remarks: FY 02 reflects actual execution. FY 03 and FY 04 reflect approved PRIP program amounts. FY 03 and FY 04 amounts include estimates for P2, FEMS, and NWD relocation, all of which require congressional notification and concurrence.

SECTION 4

FACILITIES GUIDANCE

MACOM Engineer Office (CELD-ZE):

Larry Robinson, MACOM Engineer, CELD-ZE, Telephone: 202-761-8774, Fax 202-761-1588, larry.m.robinson@usace.army.mil

or, Harry Matheos, Sr. MACOM Staff Engineer, CELD-ZE, Telephone: 202-761-8779, Fax 202-761-1588, harry.matheos@hq02.usace.army.mil

New Policy to expedite space requests

1. Provided administrative space does not exceed the USACE administrative space ceiling of 162 Net Square Feet (NSF) per person, Space Requests that increase local Command rental \$, but maintain Net Square Feet (NSF) to within 10,000 SF of the existing space (assuming that no controversy exists surrounding the acquisition) will no longer require HQUSACE approval, and in the future will be handled as follows:

- \$1 < \$50,000/Year: delegated to District Commander (DC) for requirements validation and acquisition; change will be reported to HQUSACE, CELD-ZE, with the submission of an Administrative Space Report, through MSC, within 30-days of acquisition.
- \$50,000 < \$200,000/Year: delegated to MSC Commander; DC submits to MSC for validation prior to acquisition; change will be reported to HQUSACE, CELD-ZE, by DC with the submission of an Admin Space Report, through MSC, within 30-days of acquisition.
- > \$500,000/Year: Delegated to MACOM Engineer; DC submits to MSC for requirements validation and forwards to MACOM Engineer (CELD-ZE) for endorsement; change will be reported to HQUSACE, CELD-ZE, by DC with the submission of an Admin Space Report, through MSC, within 30-days of acquisition.

Note: If there is controversy associated with the request, then HQUSACE approval is required. Submit package to the MSC for requirement validation endorsed by MACOM Engineer, CELD-ZE, and forwarded to Chief of Engineers for approval.

2. Space requests that may or may not increase rental \$, but will increase Net Square Feet (NSF) by more than 10,000 SF or will result in exceeding the USACE administrative space ceiling of 162 NSF per person, will require HQUSACE validation and the Chief of Engineers' approval. Such requests will be submitted to the MSC for requirement validation then endorsed by CELD-ZE and forwarded to the Chief of Engineers for approval. The MACOM Engineer will coordinate and clear such requests with CERE, key Headquarters staff and the OACSIM. CERE's liaison office will coordinate requests that require Title 10 Reports and seek approval from Congress.

ER 37-1-29 **DRAFT** 30 Jun 2002, defines the policies and procedures for the supervision and administration of capital assets obtained by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers used in providing goods or services. It includes procedures for programming, budgeting, allocating funds, utilization,

SECTION 4

FACILITIES GUIDANCE

calculation of costs and reporting requirements for the Revolving Fund, Plant Replacement Improvement Program (PRIP), project specific, and Operations and Maintenance, Other Procurement, Army (O&M, OPA). It applies to Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (HQUSACE), Major Subordinate Commands, and all Field Operating Activities having capital assets funded by the Revolving Fund, Civil Works projects, or Military appropriations.

Facilities master planning by all USACE individual commands is the key to sound capital investment for our internal facility needs. Facilities costs are a component of overhead that must be managed to control overhead rates and remain competitive

Subordinate commands whose office or admin space utilization rates (U.R.) remains above the DA/USACE targets, are required to maintain space reduction plans. Space utilization rates and reduction plan updates are shared with CECG at least annually (2nd Quarter CMR), and are covered in Command Staff Inspections. This supports requirement to comply with HQDA mandated space utilization goals and continuing audit of space reduction efforts.

Divisions, Labs, Centers, FOAs, and Districts will continue to monitor (and submit updates on an annual basis) the CMR facilities performance indicators, using the Utilization Rate targets established by HQDA and USACE policy. In keeping with our emphasis on providing world class office environments for our world class work force, we are also adding emphasis on provisions of AR 405-70 that stipulate a minimum (as well as a maximum) U.R. These U.R.s are 115 NSF/P (minimum) and 130 NSF/P (maximum), respectively for office space. This translates to 144 NSF/P (minimum) and 162 NSF/P (maximum), for the USACE administrative space U.R. goals. The minimum should not be disregarded any more than the maximum while supporting a quality work environment. Whenever, a new space request is forwarded to HQUSACE for validation, the project proponent will comply with AR 405-70 and the new CERM ER37-1-29 (See below for Guidance on “Typical Components of a USACE Typical Decision Package.

Beginning with this year, we will also focus on the cost impacts of space utilization decisions. The need to be competitive, to support new ways of working, and to attract and maintain a skilled world class workforce is leading USACE to focus on alternative approaches to attaining world class office environments and teaming arrangements that involve the creation of flexible office space arrangements that will support interactive, collaborative work processes. This trend will accelerate as more and more employees telework from home and telework centers.

In this changing environment, a measure of space use in the traditional office building environment, such as “space per person,” is not complete. While the CMR submission will continue to provide a baseline for visibility and management, we will also be translating space utilization rates into rental cost estimates which will be compared with actual rent bills to identify potential opportunities for reducing our office lease costs.

SECTION 4

FACILITIES GUIDANCE

As most of our facilities are controlled or leased through GSA, USACE facilities management strategy will continue to develop in line with GSA as we build on our partnering efforts. GSA relies primarily on the “guidance mode” focusing on “cost per square foot” and “cost per person,” along with “customer satisfaction” as indicators of facilities performance measurement. We will be working through a horizontal and vertical team approach (USACE-wide and with GSA) to identify meaningful metrics that will support obtaining a world class work environment, address the impact on overhead and maintaining competitive rates, and achieve best value for our world class workforce.

Presently, as in the past, the preferred USACE approach to meeting its facilities requirements is, in general, through leasing due to the flexibility leasing provides. CECG remains open to moves to military installations where practicable.

Should a USACE subordinate command determine that its needs cannot be met in the future in the current facilities, contact the MACOM Engineer Office to discuss the best course of action and appropriate documentation to address the facilities needs. A listing of typical components of a facility decision package for CECG approval is included in the Logistics MACOM Engineer website. The degree of documentation depends on the size and complexity of the request. Space requirements must be submitted through the Logistics functional channel to HQUSACE (MACOM Engineer Office) for validation early in the process to avoid delays and lost effort.

GENERAL GUIDANCE FOR A USACE FACILITY DECISION PACKAGE

-- Capital Investment Strategy, as part of an on-going master plan, affordability and flexibility are essential.

-- Identify, consider, and report on all viable alternatives. Local military installations, lease options, and the “as is”/current facility are normally among the alternatives. If you are constrained to be in the Central Business District (CBD), reflect this in your alternatives or how you plan to work around this requirement (E.O. 12072). New construction is normally the least attractive option due to funding problems and decreased flexibility with a changing workforce. Use ECONPACK for your economic analysis and recommend one of the alternatives for CG approval. Make the business case to support the move.

-- Prepare a space requirements analysis in accordance with GSA AR 405-70 and ER-37-1-29 **DRAFT** 30 Jun 2002 criteria. Demonstrate that the local administrative space utilization rate will be within USACE administrative space target of 162 nsf/authorized person, given official manning allowances and manning forecasts. Use of SF 81/81a or 1450/1450a is recommended.

-- Address employee/union impacts, and assess the need for an Environmental Impact Statement.

SECTION 4

FACILITIES GUIDANCE

- Address mission accomplishment relative to the alternatives.
- Discuss local political support or resistance to the relocation.
- Address any coordination with GSA, and GSA's position on the proposed relocation; e.g., supportive, resistant, will delegate leasing authority to Corps, etc. Clarify if the relocation is a GSA forced move.
- Address urgency. Provide timelines for needed actions including approvals and funding.
- Address impact if no relocation is approved.
- State whether systems furniture is being planned in conjunction with the relocation, and how it will be paid for.
- Clarify how you plan to pay for the relocation and associated construction and annual RPMA costs. Identify sources of funding and what funding, if any, is being requested from HQUSACE.

.....

See Logistics' MACOM Engineer website:

<http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/celd/FAC/FAC.HTM>

for hyperlinks to HQDA and GSA guidance and for additional information that may apply, e.g., "Typical Component of a USACE Facility Decision Package," including guidance on "Space Requirements Analysis," "Administrative Space Utilization Report", and a "Template for MACOM Engineer Requirements Validations."

.....

SECTION 4

FACILITIES GUIDANCE

MACOM Engineer Space Requirements Template

A Quick and easy way to see if your space request is going to fly

Here's a template that you can use to do your space analysis. If you apply the four "space requirement controls," discussed below, to your district's GSA SF-81 and Space Requirements Analysis, you will have no problem getting the approval/validation from our office. See, also, comments, above, on other issues pertinent to the MACOM Engineer.

1. Based on its most recent CMR data, the Headquarters District/Division Corps of Engineers currently has a total space requirement of _____, net square feet (NSF). This is comprised of:

- 1.1 _____, NSF of Office Space,
- 1.2 _____, NSF of Storage Space,
- 1.3 _____, NSF of Special Space, and
- 1.4 _____, NSF of Other Space
- 1.5 _____, Military Allocations
- 1.6 _____, Civil Allocations
- 1.7 _____, Total FTE Authorization
- 1.8 _____, FTE w/ Offices in ST/Special Space

2. The enclosed space accommodation request, dated _____, amends that requirement as follows:

- 2.1 _____, NSF of Office Space,
- 2.2 _____, NSF of Storage Space,
- 2.3 _____, NSF of Special Space,
- 2.4 _____, NSF of Other Space
- 2.5 _____, Military Allocations
- 2.6 _____, Civil Allocations
- 2.7 _____, Total FTE Authorization
- 2.8 _____, FTE w/ Offices in ST/Special Space

3. Office Space*. This is within the Army's maximum allowable requirement for office space of _____ NSF, for this facility, and we request that it be approved.

[Note: * Space Requirement, Control No.1: Based on the Army's utilization rate target of 130 NSF per person (NSF/P), in accordance with AR 405-70, the maximum allowable office space requirement for the total number of persons being accommodated is a total of _____ NSF (i.e., _____ P x 130 NSF/P). If your space request exceeds the maximum allowable office space requirement, by any amount, the excess space cannot be validated as necessary and must be reduced to within the Army target].

SECTION 4

FACILITIES GUIDANCE

4. Storage Space**. We can justify the need for _____ NSF of Storage Space broken down as follows:

<u>Space Description</u>	<u>Existing NSF</u>	<u>Required NSF</u>	<u>Justification</u>
--------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	----------------------

•

5. Special Space**. We can justify the need for _____ NSF of Special Space broken down as follows:

<u>Space Description</u>	<u>Existing NSF</u>	<u>Required NSF</u>	<u>Justification</u>
--------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	----------------------

•

[Note: ** Space Requirement, Control No.2: Based on the Chief's Letter, dated ____, applicable to USACE-controlled space, only: the maximum allowable combined total of Storage plus Special Space for a given building is 25-percent of the maximum allowable Office Space, i.e., for this facility, it is a total of ____ NSF (0.25 x 130 NSF/P x ____ P)].

6. Admin Space: This is within the Chief's maximum allowable space requirement for Office Space plus Storage Space plus Special Space, equal to _____ NSF for this facility, and we request that it be approved.

[Note: **Space Requirement, Control No.3: Based on the Chief's Letter, dated ____, applicable to USACE-controlled space, only: the maximum allowable combined total of Office plus Storage plus Special Space for a given building is 1.25-percent of the maximum allowable Office Space, i.e., the "Admin Space" actual, total NSF must be less than the maximum target, or under 1.62 NSF/P x No. of Persons accommodated = (1.25 x 130 NSF/P x ____ P). Any amount over this target must be justified].

7. Other Space***. We can justify the need for _____ NSF of Other Space broken down as follows:

<u>Space Description</u>	<u>Existing NSF</u>	<u>Required NSF</u>	<u>Justification</u>
--------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	----------------------

•

[Note: *** Space Requirement Control No. 4: Based on MACOM Engineer Letter of Instruction, dated ____, applicable to USACE-controlled space only. Published with Logistics CMR guidance, it identifies all Other Space by name/function. As a general rule, when the "actual" approaches the "targeted", maximum amounts of army "office space" (130 NSF/P) and "admin space" (32+130 NSF/P), the maximum target for "other" space is 38 NSF/P. This balance must be maintained to get under the HQDA ("unwritten") threshold of 200 NSF/P].

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE (FEM) SYSTEM

Facilities and Equipment Maintenance (FEM) is a Department of Defense migratory Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS). The Joint Logistics Systems Center (JLSC) developed the system to meet the needs of DOD maintenance organizations. This system was designated as a DoD migratory system in 1995. FEM is the Corps customization of MAXIMO Enterprise Base Systems (MRO Software, Inc.), which is a Commercial-Off-The-Shelf-System (COTS) package. The customization is provided to each service (Army, Navy, Air Force) to fulfill unique mission requirements. FEM integrates several plant maintenance functions into a cost-effective asset management program. It supports and consolidates functions, such as capital depreciation, equipment preventative and corrective maintenance, equipment installation, facility modification, and equipment calibration into a single management environment. The functionality also envisions an integrated application that optimizes asset use through management of corrective and preventive equipment maintenance, asset calibration, inventory and property, and maintenance budget. It provides capability to track life cycle costs of all assets, thus providing real-time accountability. In terms of expected performance outcome, deployment of FEM will standardize the maintenance business process Corps-wide. In addition, implementing FEM should reduce spare parts consumption, material purchases, maintenance labor, contract costs, calibration labor, and capital equipment acquisition. It will replace local-unique applications at several field activities, as well as automate facility and equipment maintenance management at an estimated 80% of Corps facilities, which had not developed any automation in support of their maintenance management program. FEM will also replace the corporate Vehicle Information Management (VIM) system.

FEM was designated the USACE corporate standard automated maintenance management system by the USACE Milestone Decision Authority on 10 December 1998. The Corps received Congressional support to implement in December 1999. In April 2000 the Corps entered into Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with DoD Program Manager (Navy System Support Group) for the Facilities and Equipment Maintenance (FEM) System to implement the system. The DoD Program manager provides a Corps FEM project team to manage and coordinate the development, deployment, and sustainment of the corporate Corps FEM application. Corps Headquarters has established a Corps Project Manager to serve as the Service Point of Contact for the execution of this project. The Corps has also provided representatives from the Corps maintenance community to assist in the definition of the system functional requirements and to conduct final application acceptance testing. The DoD Program Manager utilizes appropriate GSA contract vehicles to enlist the services of experienced MAXIMO implementation contractor support for the most efficient development of the USACE FEM application. The Corps FEM application has customized screens and interfaces used to provide the solution to project/plant facility and capital equipment resource planning and maintenance management. The application is designed to support current and anticipated business requirements within Corps for the next four to five year period. The FEM obtained Lifecycle Management of Information Systems (LCMIS) Milestone III on 8 Feb 02. We plan to begin USACE-wide deployment in FY 03 with and complete the implementation by FY 04.

SECTION 4

LOGISTICS GUIDANCE

Revised Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA) completed on 21 Dec 01 by DoD FEM PM validated business value benefits with a Net Present Value of \$3.578M with annual cost avoidance of \$2.812M in FY 03 and \$4.149M in FY 04. Total estimated capitalized cost provided by DoD FEM PM: \$19,300,000. Through FY 01: \$6,776,000 for development. FY 02: \$1,030,000 to complete development. FY 03: \$7,200,000 to begin implementation. FY 04: \$4,200,000 to complete implementation.

This schema reflects the funding for development, implementation, and post deployment:

	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05-12
	(\$M)	(\$M)	(\$M)	(\$M)	(\$M)	(\$M)
PRIP	4.489	2.287	1.030	7.200	4.200	
Project (Training)				1.1	1.1	
Data Conversion				.6	.6	
PRIP Payback						2.5
DoD Maintenance						1.2
TOTALS	4.489	2.287	1.030	8.900	5.900	3.7

The breakout of capitalized costs vs. expensed costs is based on DoD/Army capitalization policy provided in Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards No. 10. This required all federal agencies to report internal use software in a specified and consistent manner. This policy specified tasks that must be capitalized vs. those that must be expensed. PRIP is used to cover the capitalized costs (payback over 8 years beginning in FY 05 from appropriate accounts).

The cost for training and data conversion will be billed to the divisions, centers, and field operating activities on the year of scheduled implementation. It will be the responsibility of these elements to collect funds from subordinate activities.

The PRIP payback schedule will begin in FY 05 after the system is deployed and end in eight years. Again the division, centers, and field operating activities will be billed. This same procedure will be used to collect for funds post deployment maintenance support.

FEM implementation schedule and estimated training and data conversion cost distribution is shown below. System cost is distributed to all divisions, centers, and field operating activities based on size – one size does not fit all. There are 5 categories of size: large, medium (2 categories), and small (2 categories).

SECTION 4

LOGISTICS GUIDANCE

USACE FEM, 2 Year Implementation Order with Dates

Est Training and Data Conversion Costs	District	Name	Start	Comp	Processi ng Center
\$250,576	CENWD	Northwestern Division CENWD	10/15/02	01/30/03	WPC
	CENWS	Seattle District CENWS	10/15/02	01/15/03	WPC
	CENWK	Kansas City District CENWK	10/30/02	01/30/03	WPC
\$283,034	CESWD	Southwestern Division CESWD	11/01/02	02/28/03	CPC
	CESWL	Little Rock District CESWL	11/01/02	02/01/03	CPC
	CESWG	Galveston District CESWG	11/05/02	02/05/03	CPC
	CESWF	Fort Worth District CESWF	11/15/02	02/15/03	CPC
	CESWT	Tulsa District CESWT	11/30/02	02/28/03	CPC
\$637,888	CELRD-GL	Great Lakes and Ohio River Division CELRD	12/1/02	04/30/03	WPC
	CELRE	Detroit District CELRE	12/1/02	03/1/03	WPC
	CELRH	Huntington District CELRH	12/5/02	03/5/03	WPC
	CELRP	Pittsburgh District CELRP	12/15/02	03/15/03	WPC
	CELRL	Louisville District CELRL	1/5/03	04/5/03	WPC
	CELRN	Nashville District CELRN	1/10/03	04/10/03	WPC
	CELRB	Buffalo District CELRB	1/15/03	04/15/03	WPC
	CELRD	Chicago District CELRD	1/30/03	04/30/03	WPC
\$674,197	CEMVD	Mississippi Valley Division CEMVD	2/1/03	05/28/03	CPC
	CEMVN	New Orleans District CEMVN	2/1/03	05/1/03	CPC
	CEMVR	Rock Island District CEMVR	2/5/03	05/5/03	CPC
	CEMVS	St. Louis District CEMVS	2/15/03	05/15/03	CPC
	CEMVK	Vicksburg District CEMVK	2/18/03	05/18/03	CPC
	CEMVM	Memphis District CEMVM	2/20/03	05/20/03	CPC
	CEMVP	St. Paul District CEMVP	2/28/03	05/28/03	CPC
\$470,022	CESAD	South Atlantic Division CESAD	4/1/03	08/30/03	CPC
	CESAM	Mobile District CESAM	4/1/03	07/1/03	CPC
	CESAS	Savannah District CESAS	5/1/03	08/1/03	CPC
	CESAW	Wilmington District CESAW	5/5/03	08/5/03	CPC
	CESAC	Charleston District CESAC	5/15/03	08/15/03	CPC
	CESAJ	Jacksonville District CESAJ	5/30/03	08/30/03	CPC
\$46,401	CEHNC	Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville CEHNC	6/1/03	09/1/03	CPC
\$212,353	CESPD	South Pacific Division CESPD	6/5/03	01/15/04	WPC
	CESPA	Albuquerque District CESPA	6/5/03	09/5/03	WPC

SECTION 4

LOGISTICS GUIDANCE

	CESPK	Sacramento District CESPK	10/01/03	01/01/04	WPC
	CESPL	Los Angeles District CESPL	10/05/03	01/05/04	WPC
	CESPN	San Francisco District CESPN	10/15/03	01/15/04	WPC
\$204,174	CEERD	U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center CEERD	11/01/03	02/30/04	CPC
	CEERD	Vicksburg	11/01/03	02/01/04	CPC
	CEERD	Champaign	11/05/03	02/05/04	CPC
	CEERD	Ft Belvoir	11/15/03	02/15/04	CPC
	CEERD	Hanover	11/30/03	02/30/04	CPC
\$516,424	CENAD	North Atlantic Division CENAD	12/1/03	04/28/04	WPC
	CENAD	Baltimore District CENAB	12/1/03	03/1/04	WPC
	CENAP	Philadelphia District CENAP	2/1/04	04/1/04	WPC
	CENAE	New England District CENAE	2/5/04	04/5/04	WPC
	CENAN	New York District CENAN	2/15/04	04/15/04	WPC
	CENAO	Norfolk District CENAO	2/18/04	04/18/04	WPC
	CENAU	Europe District CENAU	2/28/04	04/28/04	WPC
\$73,149	CEHEC	Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity CEHEC	3/1/04	06/1/04	CPC
\$46,401	CEPPB	Prime Power School	3/5/04	06/5/04	CPC
\$127,174	CEPOD	Pacific Ocean Division CEPOD	3/10/04	06/30/04	WPC
	CEPOA	Alaska District CEPOA	3/10/04	06/10/04	WPC
	CEPOH	Honolulu District CEPOH	3/15/04	06/15/04	WPC
	CEPOJ	Japan District CEPOJ	3/20/04	06/20/04	WPC
	CEPOF	Far East District CEPOF	3/30/04	06/30/04	WPC
\$17,186	CETAC	Transatlantic Programs Center CETAC	4/04/04	07/04/04	CPC

SECTION 4

LOGISTICS GUIDANCE

FEM estimated PRIP payback and post deployment maintenance support cost:

PRIP PAYBACK AND POST DEPLOYMENT SUPPORT COSTS

Est PRIP Payback per FY	Est Post Deployment per FY	District	Name	Start	Comp
\$381,077	\$182,613	CENWD	Northwestern Division CENWD	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CENWS	Seattle District CENWS	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CENWK	Kansas City District CENWK	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$184,370	\$88,351	CESWD	Southwestern Division CESWD	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESWL	Little Rock District CESWL	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESWG	Galveston District CESWG	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESWF	Fort Worth District CESWF	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESWT	Tulsa District CESWT	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$417,372	\$193,217	CELRD- GL	Great Lakes and Ohio River Division CELRD	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CELRE	Detroit District CELRE	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CELRH	Huntington District CELRH	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CELRP	Pittsburgh District CELRP	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CELRL	Louisville District CELRL	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CELRN	Nashville District CELRN	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CELRB	Buffalo District CELRB	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CELRC	Chicago District CELRC	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$429,029	\$205,592	CEMVD	Mississippi Valley Division CEMVD	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEMVN	New Orleans District CEMVN	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEMVR	Rock Island District CEMVR	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEMVS	St. Louis District CEMVS	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEMVK	Vicksburg District CEMVK	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEMVM	Memphis District CEMVM	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEMVP	St. Paul District CEMVP	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$301,225	\$144,348	CESAD	South Atlantic Division CESAD	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESAM	Mobile District CESAM	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESAS	Savannah District CESAS	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESAW	Wilmington District CESAW	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESAC	Charleston District CESAC	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESAJ	Jacksonville District CESAJ	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$29,565	\$14,167	CEHNC	Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville CEHNC	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$136,646	\$65,481	CESPD	South Pacific Division CESPD	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESPA	Albuquerque District CESPA	10/01/05	9/30/12

SECTION 4

LOGISTICS GUIDANCE

		CESPK	Sacramento District CESPK	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESPL	Los Angeles District CESPL	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CESPN	San Francisco District CESPN	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$127,804	\$61,244	CEERD	U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center CEERD	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEERD	Vicksburg	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEERD	Champaign	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEERD	Ft Belvior	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEERD	Hanover	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$330,789	\$158,515	CENAD	North Atlantic Division CENAD	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CENAD	Baltimore District CENAB	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CENAP	Philadelphia District CENAP	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CENAE	New England District CENAE	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CENAN	New York District CENAN	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CENAO	Norfolk District CENAO	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CENAU	Europe District CENAU	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$47,952	\$22,979	CEHEC	Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity CEHEC	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$29,565	\$14,167	CEPPB	Prime Power School	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$81,996	\$38,829	CEPOD	Pacific Ocean Division CEPOD	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEPOA	Alaska District CEPOA	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEPOH	Honolulu District CEPOH	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEPOJ	Japan District CEPOJ	10/01/05	9/30/12
		CEPOF	Far East District CEPOF	10/01/05	9/30/12
\$10,950	\$5,247	CETAC	Transatlantic Programs Center CETAC	10/01/05	9/30/12

SECTION 3

CONTRACTING OUT GUIDANCE

CIVIL WORKS CONTRACTING OUT GUIDANCE

It is the policy of the Corps of Engineers to maintain a balanced program of in-house and contract work on all phases of the Civil Works program. The percentage of work contracted out varies with the different phases of the projects.

In the Planning, Engineering, and Design phases, sufficient work must be accomplished in-house to maintain the technical expertise required to properly define, manage, and review the work of architect-engineer contractors. Based on the projected size of the FY 03 Civil Works program, the programmatic level of contracting for Planning, Engineering, and Design products, that will maintain technical expertise, is 40% as measured by the Cost of Doing Business (CDB) report. While Civil Works contracting for planning, engineering, and construction phase service is no longer a Command Management Review indicator, Civil Works Engineering and Construction Division will monitor quarterly CDB summaries from the various MSC's and report those incidents where MSC's fall below 30% on the CDB.

The CDB measures contracting of products, which are produced by a team consisting of many elements of the command. While for many items planning and engineering provide a large portion of the product, the team efforts also involve Project-Program Management, Real Estate, and other elements of the district. As such, the responsibility of maintaining an appropriate level of contracting is a corporate responsibility. The distribution of in-house and contracting work at the District level must be viewed as a command-wide action. The MSC Regional Management Board (RMB) is responsible for balancing the contracting effort across districts. While it is desirable for the various districts to maintain a uniform level of contracting, the MSC RMB may adjust the contracting level for any District to meet the current and future needs and goals of the MSC.

SECTION 3

COMMAND STAFF INSPECTIONS

USACE ORGANIZATIONAL INSPECTION PROGRAM

1. The HQUSACE OIP will consist of Command Staff Inspections and IG Inspections.

HQUSACE Command Staff Inspections (CSI) consist of three-day visits to USACE Divisions by the DCG and selected staff principals once in every 18-month cycle. Specific implementation guidance will be made available by the proponent. A CSI schedule is provided below to cover the next three fiscal years.

IG Inspections will be conducted by the Office of the Engineer Inspector General in accordance with the provisions of AR 20-1 and AR 1-201. The Commander will direct inspection focus and scheduling.

2. The OIP for USACE Divisions and the 249th Engineer Battalion (Prime Power) will consist of Command Inspections and Staff Assistance Visits.

Division commanders and the 249th Engineer Battalion Commander will conduct **Command Inspections** of their respective organizations. The frequency and scope of these inspections will be tailored to meet the needs of each commander.

Division staffs and the 249th Engineer Battalion staff, as directed by the respective commander or staff principal, will conduct **Staff Assistance Visits**.

FY 03-05 Command Inspection Dates:

<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>	<u>FY 05</u>
Nov 2002 SWD	Nov 2003 LRD	Nov 2004 NWD
Jan 2003 POD	Feb 2004 NAD	Feb 2005 MVD/ERDC
Mar 2003 NWD	Apr 2004 SPD	Apr 2005 SAD
May 2003 MVD/ERDC	Jun 2004 SWD	Jun 2005 HNC/TAC
Jul 2003 SAD	Aug 2004 POD	Aug 2005 LRD
Aug 2003 HNC/TAC		

SECTION 3

CONFERENCES

ER 37-1-18 provides guidance and instructions for conducting all USACE sponsored meetings and conferences. (This ER is being updated but the update will not change basic content herein). The CG has approved the following *Standard Recurring Approved Conferences* which support our strategic vision. Other meetings that involve 25 or more Department of the Army (DA) personnel in a TDY status are *Special Meetings* that are approved on an ‘as needed’ basis. MSC Commanders, HQUSACE Management Staff will follow ER 37-1-18 in gaining these approvals.

HQUSACE STANDARD RECURRING APPROVED CONFERENCES

Senior Leaders’ Conference (with the associated Emerging Leaders Conference)
Spring USACE Leaders Workshop (with ENFORCE) Security and Law Enforcement Conference
Fall District Commanders Conference (in DC) CP-55 Career Program Managers Workshop
* Worldwide DPW Training Workshop National Regulatory Conference
* Project Delivery Team Conference¹
* USACE Technical Transfer Conference²
* Navigation Conference (*PL95-269 & WRDA*)
Small Business Conference (in DC)
CP-18 Career Program Managers Seminar
Worldwide USACE Legal Services Conference
Real Estate Conference
Finance and Accounting Conference
Resource Management Conference
Information Managers Symposium

These HQUSACE sponsored Conferences will have specific mission purposes, clearly written objectives, and After Action Reviews (AAR) to assess if objectives were met. HQUSACE Management Staff will include success in meeting conference/workshop objectives in appropriate senior leaders’ performance evaluations.

The intent of the Commander is also that MSC and Center Commanders plan for and conduct staff rides at least annually as a means of communicating and facilitating teamwork among our people.

* The MP and CW managed Conferences will have a total not to exceed 3200 mandays per year.

¹ The focus audience for this conference will be division chiefs at district, division and HQs, representing the disciplines that comprise the project team concept for cradle to grave project management. Intent is to facilitate the maturation of this project management concept, eliminate stovepipe mentality, and to engrain this concept into our organization culture. The focus of each year’s conference would vary based on different phases of a project. While each conference would include representation from all the disciplines comprising the project team, attendance would be weighted towards those disciplines supporting that conference’s focus area. This strategy supports the “train the trainer” concept as only a fraction of the leadership involved with project management across districts and divisions will be able to attend each year. Annual scheduling provides the ability to establish continuity between conferences and over time to reach a greater percentage of Corps employees associated with the project management process.

² The conferences conducted within this framework will consist of a series of workshops that will have written objectives and specific mission purposes approved by the Deputy Commanding General(s) of MP & CW. The number, size and type of workshops will vary each year, but the total number of mandays involved would remain relatively constant. The focus audience of the workshops would generally be below the branch chief level. Each workshop will focus on a particular discipline, with the purpose of disseminating information, receiving feedback, sharing lessons learned and best practices, and clarifying guidance to assure that critical policies, methods and resolutions of major issues are understood.

SECTION 3

USACE MGT CONTROL PLAN

1. Army Regulation 11-2, Management Control (1 August 1994), directs that organizations develop a Management Control Plan (MCP) describing how their required management control evaluations will be conducted over a five-year period. Our five-year plan covers FY 03–07, and updates will be published in conjunction with Army updates.
2. The USACE MCP is a compilation of appropriate Army functions requiring Management Control Evaluations and other areas identified by HQUSACE functional staff. You should tailor this plan to your specific workload and environment. As in the past, the mandatory evaluation areas on this plan plus any others you consider appropriate will constitute the MCP for MSCs, ERDC, TAC, HNC, districts, and FOAs.
3. Management control evaluations may be conducted in one of two ways—management control checklists or existing management review processes. Checklists and key management controls for FY 03–07 are in the USACE 5-year plan which can be found at the RM website. Existing review processes acceptable for use by USACE organizations to evaluate key management controls include Command Inspections, Command Management Reviews, Command and Staff Assistance Visits, and scheduled audits/inspections. Another source of Army’s mandatory control areas is the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller (ASA (FM&C)), website (<http://www.asafm.army.mil/fo/fod/mc/mc.asp>). Upon opening the website, click on the first entry “Army Management Control Evaluations” and follow the directions given thereafter.
4. Management controls monitoring and evaluation is a year-round activity. The formal process generally begins each year in April or May with the publication by ASA (FM&C) of the requirements for reporting on Management Controls within the Department of the Army. The process culminates in September or October with the Secretary of the Army’s Annual Statement of Assurance on Management Controls to the Secretary of Defense. These requirements are then incorporated into the data call published by HQUSACE forwarded to subordinate USACE organizations. The data collected is then analyzed and incorporated into the annual statement from the Chief of Engineers/Commanding General, USACE, to the Secretary of the Army.
5. Proponent for this process is CERM-P.

SECTION 3

USACE MANAGEMENT CONTROL PLAN

USACE Org	Army/USACE Function	Evaluation Areas	Related Reg	Checklists / Key Controls Published In:	Alternative Method	Evaluation Level		Evaluation Required						Last Evaluated
						HQ	MSC/Dist	F Y 0 3	F Y 0 4	F Y 0 5	F Y 0 6	F Y 0 7		
CI	Info Mgmt	Army Info Resources Management Program	AR 25-1	AR 25-1	CMR & CMD Inspections*	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01	
CI	Info Assurance (99 MW)	Info Systems Security (Mgmt Weakness)	AR 380-19	AR 25-1	CMD Inspections*	X	MD	X	X	X	X	X	FY01	
CW	Civil Works	Regulatory Programs	33 CFR 320-331	15 Oct 99 CECW memo	CMR and Div Visits	X	M D	X		X			FY99	
CW	Civil Works	Direct Program Development--Annual Prog / Budget Req	EC 11-2-179	EC (pgs 12 & 24)		X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01	
CW	Civil Works	Engineering and Design	ER 1110-2-1150	ER (App H)		X	M D			X			FY98	
CW	Civil Works	Emergency Management Activities	ER 11-1-320	ER (Apps F,G,H)		X	M D	X					FY98	
CS	USACE Business Process	Program and Project Management	ER 5-1-11	CECSMemo2Jul01	CMR/CMD Inspections	X	M					X	FY01	
CC	Legal	Claims Services	AR 27-20	Appendix B	CMD Inspections	X	M D	X					FY97	
EO	EEO	EEO and Affirmative Action	AR 690-12	Cmd Insp Checklist	CMD Inspections	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01	
EO	EEO	EEO Discrimination Complaints	AR 690-600	Cmd Insp Checklist	CMD Inspections	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01	
EO	EEO	Nondiscrimination in Progs/Actvts Asst'd	AR 690-600	Cmd Insp Checklist	CMD Inspections	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01	
HR	Personnel (Military)	Personnel Accounting & Strength Reporting	AR 600-8-6	MILPER Memo 97-002		X	M D						FY98	
HR	Personnel (Military)	Leaves and Passes	AR 600-8-10	MILPER Memo 97-001		X	M D	X	X			X	FY01	
HR	Personnel (Military)	Monitoring Active Duty Service Obligations	AR 350-100	AR		X	M D							
HR	Personnel (Military)	Special Duty Pay	AR 614-200	AR		X	M D					X	FY01	
HR	Personnel (Military)	Personnel Info -- Indebtedness Remission	AR 600-4	AR		X	M D	X						
HR	Personnel	Employee Benefits - Unemployment Compensation Prog	AR 690-800-850	AR									New Area	
HR	Personnel	ACTEDS - Funding Control	AR 690-950	AR									New Area	
IG	Inspector General	Training	AR 20-1	Appendix B	N/A	X			X				FY99	
IG	Inspector General	Inspections	AR 20-1	Appendix B	N/A	X			X				FY99	
IG	Inspector General	Investigations	AR 20-1	Appendix B	N/A	X			X				FY99	
IG	Inspector General	Assistance	AR 20-1	Appendix B	N/A	X			X				FY99	
IG	Inspector General	Information Resources	AR 20-1	Appendix B	N/A	X			X				FY99	
IG	Inspector General	Intelligence Oversight	AR 20-1	Appendix B	N/A	X			X				FY99	
IG	Inspector General	Legal	AR 20-1	Appendix B	N/A	X			X				FY99	
IR	Internal Review	Audits / Internal Controls	AR 11 - 7	AR	CMD Inspections *	x	MD	X	X	X	X	X	FY01	
LD	Supply	Supply Activities	AR 710-2	CELD Checklist		X	M D			X			FY98	
LD	Transportation	Transportation Services	DOD4500.9R	EP 700-7-1 (App E)			M D		X		X	X	FY01	
LD	Facilities	Facilities Support	AR 420-10	EP 700-7-1 (App D)		X	M D			X			FY95	
LD	Maintenance	Maintenance Activities	AR 750-1	ER 750-1-1 (App E)		X	M D			X			FY98	
LD	Logistics	Aviation Management	OMB Cir A-126	EP 700-7-1		X	M D	X					FY98	

SECTION 3

USACE MANAGEMENT CONTROL PLAN

USACE Org	Army/USACE Function	Evaluation Areas	Related Reg	Checklists / Key Controls Published In:	Alternative Method	Evaluation Level		Evaluation Required					Last Evaluated
						HQ	MSC/Dist	F Y 0 3	F Y 0 4	F Y 0 5	F Y 0 6	F Y 0 7	
CW/MP	Construction	Engineering and Design Quality Management	ER 1110-1-12	ER (Apps G,H,I,J)	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	*	*	*	*	*	FY99
CW/MP	Construction	Design and Construction Evaluation	ER 415-1-13	ER (Apps B,C)	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	*	*	*	*	*	FY99
CW/MP	Construction	Construction Quality Management	ER 1180-1-6	ER 1180-1-6	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	*	*	*	*	*	FY99
PR	Procurement	Contracting	AFARS	AFARS (App DD)		X	M D			X			FY00
RE	Real Estate	Real Property Acquisition-Leasing	AR 405-10	interim checklist	CMD Inspections *	X	M D			X	X		FY01
RE	Real Estate	Homeowners Assistance Program	AR 405-16	4 Apr 95 memo	CMD Inspections *	X	D	X					FY98
RE	Real Estate	Outgranting	AR 405-80	AR (App C)	CMD Inspections *	X	M D		X				FY99
RE	Real Estate	Disposal	AR 405-90	interim checklist	CMD Inspections *	X	M D			X			FY01
RM	Construction	Construction Fiscal Management	ER 415-1-16	Appendix C	CMR / CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X			X	FY01
RM	USAAA CFO Audit	CFO Issues	ER 37-2-10	CERM-F (15 Nov 99)	DCG Mthly Assessments	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
RM	Accounting	Revolving Fund Operation	ER 37-2-10	ER (Ch 19, App A)	CMR / CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
RM UFC	FM	Accounting Operations Activities	ER 37-2-10	DFAS-IN 37-1 (App H)	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
RM	FM	Management Controls	AR 11-2	AR	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
RM	FM	Budget Execution	AR37-49/ER37-1-24	SAFM-BUC (19 Jul 96)	RMBs / Cmd Inspections *	X	M D	X					FY99
RM	Personnel	Manpower Management Activities	AR 570-4	SAFM-FMMR (13 Nov 98)		X	M D					X	FY01
RM	FM	Purchase Card Program	SAFM	APC Inst Manual (Mar 97)	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
RM	FM	USACE Indirect Costing Policy	EC 37-1-261	CERM-P Checklist	CMR / CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X				X	FY01
RM	FM	Army Travel Charge Card Program		SAFM Checklist	CMR	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
RM UFC	FM	Travel Pay Activities		DFAS-IN 37-1 (App H)		X	TAC/POD	X			X		FY99
RM UFC	FM	Disbursing Activities		DFAS-IN 37-1 (App L)		X	TAC/POD	X			X		FY99
RM UFC	FM	Commerical Accounts Activities		DFAS-IN 37-1 (App G)		X	TAC/POD	X			X		FY99
RM	ACSIM	Army Civilian Inmate Labor Program	AR 210-35	AR (App D)	HQDA Annual Review	X	D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
SO	Mgmt & Cmd	Management of Explosives Safety Program	AR 385-64	AR	Army Safety Prog Eval.	X	M D	X					FY99
SO	Mgmt & Cmd	Chemical Agents	AR 385-61	AR	Army Safety Prog Eval.	X	M D				X		FY01
SO	Personnel	Mgmt of Civilian Injury/Illness Program	AR 690-800-810	SAMR 13 Nov 96 Mem	CMR/CMD Inspections *		M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
SPO	Security	Physical Security Inspection Program	AR 190-13	CECS-OS Memo 29 Jul	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
SPO	Intelligence/Security	Counterintelligence Program	AR 381-20	CECS-OS Memo 29 Jul	CMD Inspections *	X		X	X	X	X	X	FY01
SPO	Security	Anti-terrorism & Force Protect	AR 525-13	CECS-OS Memo 29 Jul	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
SPO	Intelligence	Information Security	AR 380-5	CECS-OS Memo 29 Jul	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X	FY01
* FY evaluation requirements are dependent on the command inspection schedules for MSCs/Dists--conduct evaluation in preparation for command visit Scheduled Command Inspections are as follows: FY02: POD,SPD,NWD,SWD; FY03: MVD,ERDC,SAD,LRD,NAD													
Various regulation links take you to the ASA F&M Homepage, you must then navigate to your evaluation area through the toolbar on the left. Army Management Control Plan Web Page													

SECTION 3

USACE SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM

The USACE Small Business Office provides command-wide management oversight to the USACE Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (SADBU) Program. The mission is to advocate the award of a fair portion of contracts to Small and Disadvantaged Businesses; promulgate policy, establish procedures, publish direction and guidance for USACE MSCs; act as principal advisor to the USACE Command Group and Deputy Chiefs of Staff on all matters pertaining to the Small Business Program; and provide guidance to Chiefs of the Small Business Office at the MSCs. The Director of Small Business (GS-15) is appointed by the Commander pursuant to DOD Directive 4205.1. Paragraph D1d(2) of the directive requires that the Director report directly to the Commander or his Deputy.

Develops and assigns command-wide performance goals for all socioeconomic elements of the Program. Establishes and maintains continuing liaison with industry via outreach counseling. Develops/implements innovative methods for doing business with all businesses that qualify under the various socioeconomic programs. Supports members of Congress through participation in Business Opportunity and Federal Procurement Conferences. Acts as initial POC and focal point for industry inquiries.

Specific performance targets for FY 02 through FY 06 assigned by Secretary of the Army are listed in table. Not all statutory goals are identified in the table below as they are not included in Secretary of the Army's performance targets for USACE. All statutory goals can be found in Public Laws.

Scorecard Elements	FY 02 Target	FY 03 Target	FY 04 Target	FY 05 Target	FY 06 Target
PRIME Contracting					
Small Business	41.0%	41.9%	42.7%	43.4%	44.0%
Small Disadvantaged Business	15.8%	16.1%	16.4%	16.7%	16.9%
HUBZone Small Business	2.5%	3.0%	3.1%	3.2%	3.2%
Women-Owned Small Business	4.8%	5.4%	5.5%	5.6%	5.7%
HBCU/MI	12.9%	13.2%	13.4%	13.6%	13.8%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Subcontracting					
Small Business	69.6%	71.1%	72.4%	73.5%	74.5%
Small Disadvantaged Business	10.0%	10.2%	10.4%	10.6%	10.7%
HUBZone Small Business	2.5%	3.0%	3.1%	3.2%	3.2%
Women-Owned Small Business	10.4%	10.6%	10.8%	11.0%	11.2%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%